

No. 66A



N° 66A

---

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Monday 5 June 2000**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Lundi 5 juin 2000**

Speaker  
Honourable Gary Carr

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable Gary Carr

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

---

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Copies of Hansard**

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

### **Exemplaires du Journal**

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF ONTARIO

Monday 5 June 2000

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 5 juin 2000

*The House met at 1330.  
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

DAWN PATROL GROUP HOMES

**Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain):**

Today I would like to acknowledge the Dawn Patrol Group Homes, a non-profit, registered charitable organization which has provided programs and services to youth and their families in the Hamilton-Wentworth area since 1969.

Dawn Patrol is guided by a set of core values which include providing a safe, secure environment in which programs are delivered to assist troubled youth to achieve a potential to live as law-abiding citizens. These programs include anger management, victim awareness, drug and alcohol counselling, independent living, self-esteem and others.

Bernhardt House, Newcombe House and the Hamilton Alternative to Custody program are staffed by dedicated and well-trained personnel committed to our youth. I salute them and the voluntary board of directors for the fine work they do in my community.

At the same time, discussions I have had with the president of Dawn Patrol's board of directors indicate that they are chronically underfunded to retain the quality staff needed to be successful in their challenging work.

Today I will be crossing the House with a letter for the Minister of Community and Social Services which outlines the need for additional funding for this outstanding community service organization. It is my hope that the government will take action and not just talk with respect to prevention programs for youth crimes.

BOWMANVILLE WOMEN'S INSTITUTE

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** Last week in my riding of Durham the Bowmanville Women's Institute celebrated its 100th anniversary.

The Bowmanville Women's Institute has played an important role in our community and province since its inception on June 1, 1900. In the early 20th century, farmers joined organizations such as the Farmers' Institutes in order to share their knowledge and innovative practices and techniques. There were no such organizations for the wives of the farmers until Adelaide

Hoodless founded the Women's Institute and launched a campaign for pasteurizing milk following the death of her young son.

Since then, the women's institute has continued to focus on issues important to families and their communities. They have successfully adjusted their current focus to meet society's needs over time. Some examples of their involvement in Bowmanville include the institute's program to distribute hand-knit blankets to premature babies across the country, and of course their bursaries for high school students, specifically Bowmanville high school.

Currently, members of this dedicated organization include president Bernice Puk, Lyra Flintoff, Iva Twist, Vera Downey, Elva McKnight, Hazel Thoms, Mary Tough, Emily Slute, Jean McCallum, Louise Bell, Helen Millson, Betty Morrison, Joan Cook, Irene England and Ruth Carrington. The group meets once a month to discuss different issues while furthering the positive role of the Women's Institute in our community.

I would like all members to extend their congratulations to the Bowmanville Women's Institute for their commitment to our community.

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to seek unanimous consent to wear the blue and gold ribbon of the Raise Values Above Violence campaign. I've send it off to all members of the Legislature.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

VIOLENCE

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** I am very proud to stand here in the Legislature today to tell all members of the House and the Ontario public about a campaign that began in my community of Thunder Bay and is now extends all across the province. It is a campaign that is called Raise Values Above Violence, begun by the Thunder Bay diocese of the Catholic Women's League of Canada and formed as an offshoot of the Thunder Bay Television's award-winning campaign Speak Out Against Violence. The CWL's campaign is based on the belief that values such as unconditional love and kindness can have a positive impact on violence in all our communities and that solutions to violence can be found by simply treating everyone with equality, kindness and respect.

At a time when many of us continue to worry about violence in our society, it is heartening to be part of a campaign that I believe has truly made a difference in our community. For that reason, I am proud to wear the blue and gold ribbon of the campaign and I would encourage all members of the House also to wear it and to spread the word about the Raise Values Above Violence campaign in their communities.

As we know all too well, violence has become one of the defining characteristics of our age. All too often, violence has been seen as an acceptable way to solve problems. When we incorporate positive values into our everyday living, we live happier and healthier lives, and we then contribute to happier and healthier families and communities. During this campaign week, the Catholic women's league invites public involvement and participation to raise values above violence. We all truly can make a difference.

#### WESTBEN ARTS FESTIVAL THEATRE

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** Northumberland has one of the most beautiful landscapes in Ontario. I've always admired the gentle, rolling hills and the lush green space. Settled amongst the rolling hills in a century-old farm near Campbellford there sits a rustic timber-frame barn. Nearby will become the home for a full symphony orchestra, an 80-voice chorus, some of Canada's top soloists, Juno Awards winners and international recording stars. This barn will be a modern performance theatre known as the Westben Arts Festival Theatre.

Westben is a not-for-profit organization that was established in 1991 by Donna Bennett and Brian Finley. Both Donna and Brian are extremely talented musicians who have brought a wealth of international performance experience to their community. Their talent and energy have attracted many and, in 1997, they directed a large group of community volunteers in a very successfully staged production of Jesus Christ Superstar. The success of the production ignited the entire community.

Because Campbellford does not have its own theatre for live performances, the members of Westben decided they would undergo the challenge of building one. Now the members of Westben are putting the finishing touches on their new theatre in preparation for the grand gala opening on July 1. I extend my best wishes to all the members of the Westben Arts Festival Theatre and I hope this wonderful initiative is a major success.

#### ONTARIANS WITH DISABILITIES LEGISLATION

**Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London):** I rise today to raise awareness Golden Horseshoe Marathon which began today on the front steps of the Legislature. It was great to see members from all sides of the House taking part in this event. It was also great to see the

Honourable Cam Jackson and myself as the only two MPPs who were able to finish five kilometres.

The marathon will see athletes push their wheelchairs 210 kilometres in five days. It was created to raise funds for a resource centre that will help others who are in rehab cope with the changes that accompany spinal cord injuries and life in a wheelchair. Charlie Cetinski, the driving force behind this event and an athlete himself, revealed through his own experience the need for increased support, information and positive motivation in this province.

I'd also like to draw attention to a few other important dates. May and June of this year have celebrated Brain Injury Awareness Month, National Access Awareness Week for disabled persons, and Wheel Chair Awareness Week. These are important dates to remember as we work toward the passing of a strong and effective Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The issue has been discussed a number of times in this House, but my fear now is that legislation is being pushed further and further from this government's agenda. Recent signals from the other side, including correspondence from the minister's office, indicate that we "may" see the introduction of legislation by November 23, 2001. Let me remind the members of this House that we passed a resolution unanimously calling for the enactment of a strong and effective ODA by November 23, 2001. We need to do everything we can now. The time has come to pass a strong and effective Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

1340

#### DOCTOR SHORTAGE

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** Last week, five specialists and one family physician left our community. That brings us to a total of 15 doctors who have left the Sudbury region since January 1999. This month, the underserved area program listings show a shortage of 11 family doctors in Sudbury and the outlying areas. Families need physicians now. The prospect of a northern medical school sometime in the future, or physicians coming four years from now in exchange for free tuition, does nothing to help those seeking primary care now.

The Minister of Health could quickly ease our doctor shortage problem. Last Thursday, she spoke to the association of community health centres. Representatives from the Centre de santé communautaire de Sudbury were able to have a brief conversation with the minister at the time and share with her a solution to the doctors' crisis in Sudbury. She was asked to provide \$500,000 in funding to both satellite clinics in Valley East and Rayside-Balfour. With this, the centre would hire one more full-time doctor, nurse, nurse practitioner, social worker and nutritionist at each site. The centre has found three physicians who want to work in these communities, on salary in a group practice.

It's important to note that both Valley East and Rayside-Balfour are on the underserved area list for

doctors. Both satellite operations have waiting lists of over 400 possible patients who could enrol with these practices if more health care providers were available. With minimal financial investment, the Minister of Health could buy a lot of first-class primary health care for many people in those two communities. I hope the minister will see the wisdom of this request and fund this immediately.

#### SNOWMOBILING

**Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre):** With us today in the members' gallery are executives from the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs led by president Bert Grant, and Bill Small, Dennis Burns, Tom Sutcliffe, Ted Day and Tim West. They join us today because they're hosting an MPP reception in the legislative dining room today from 5 to 7 to demonstrate the vast appeal and size of the number one recreational winter sport in Ontario: snowmobiling.

The federation represents 281 clubs and an estimated active number of 225 snowmobiling families across this province. This is a \$1-billion industry to our province and extremely important to the winter economic activity of Ontario. I would suggest too that there are 49,000 kilometres of trails in this province, more than we have provincial highways. The OFSC, through its charities across Ontario, annually donates about \$500,000 to the Easter Seal Society through their various snowmobile activities.

There are a lot of changes we are looking to introduce in the snowmobiling industry over next two or three years to make it a safer, better, stronger sport for the families of Ontario. I encourage all members to attend the reception tonight and learn more about snowmobiling in Ontario.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Every day seems to bring a new culprit in the Premier's blame game over the crisis in the drinking water system in Ontario. In Walkerton, under fire for highly damaging cuts to the Ministry of the Environment budget and staff, the Premier suggested the problem could be traced to the NDP policy of charging municipalities for water tests done at the Ministry of the Environment labs and allowing municipalities to use private labs if they wanted to do so.

When that excuse didn't fly, Mike Harris decided it was human error and not his dismantling of the environment and natural resources ministries that caused the tragic events in Walkerton. When that deflection of blame didn't work, the Premier tried to say that a public inquiry, which he had resisted so strenuously for days, was now acceptable because the opposition would not agree to a legislative committee completely controlled by Conservative MPPs.

This morning the Premier pointed the finger at municipalities for not allocating funds for sewer and water

projects even though it was his government that dumped responsibility for these systems on to all municipalities. There's downloading of many responsibilities to municipalities: public housing, public health, ambulance services, senior services, roads, and the list goes on. They made the eligibility requirements for provincial funding so stringent that many municipalities cannot qualify.

If the Premier wishes to find the ultimate culprit for the drinking water woes of this province, he need look no further than his own mirror and the pages of the Conservative policy document known as the Common Sense Revolution.

#### SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE

**Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):** In contrast to the recent ramblings by the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex, I'd like to recognize Agriculture Minister Ernie Hardeman for his work in making sure Ontario farmers receive their fair share of federal safety net funding. Recently, though, we learned that the federal government is pulling back 50% of the AIDA enhancement funding. Without more federal money, this will result in funds taken out of Ontario and diverted to farmers in other provinces.

I point to a May 23 press release of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture titled "Prime Minister Forgets About Farmers." In it, OFA president Jack Wilkinson, after stating that the Prime Minister did not mention agriculture to a meeting attended by nearly 500 farmers near Kitchener, says, "The federal government hasn't delivered any of the AIDA funding it announced last November."

I challenge the member opposite to talk to farmers in his riding; find out if they support more money for farmers in other provinces and less for Ontario's farmers. Farmers are pleased with Minister Hardeman's guarantee of Ontario's 40% share, but they are concerned that the federal government is taking money away from Ontario farmers to make their numbers add up. This suggests to me that trusting Liberals with farmers' money makes about as much sense as trusting rabbits to deliver lettuce.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly and move its adoption.

**Clerk at the Table (Ms Lisa Freedman):** Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 42, An Act to enhance public safety and to improve competitiveness by ensuring compliance with modernized technical standards in various industries /  
Projet de loi 42, Loi visant à accroître la sécurité

publique et à améliorer la compétitivité en assurant l'observation de normes techniques modernisées dans plusieurs industries.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### PUBLIC HOUSING PRESERVATION ACT, 2000

#### LOI DE 2000 SUR LA PRÉSERVATION DU LOGEMENT PUBLIC

Mr Marchese moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 84, An Act to require the preservation of public housing / Projet de loi 84, Loi exigeant la préservation du logement public.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

The member for a short statement.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** Briefly, my bill would prevent the sale of any public housing units unless those units are replaced with other social housing units and tenants are given another, comparable unit right away.

### HURON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ACT, 2000

Mr Wood moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting Huron University College.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

## MOTIONS

### HOUSE SITTINGS

**Hon Frank Klees (Minister without Portfolio):** I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Monday, June 5, Tuesday, June 6, and Wednesday, June 7, 2000, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### DIRECT DEMOCRACY THROUGH MUNICIPAL REFERENDUMS ACT, 2000

#### LOI DE 2000 SUR LA DÉMOCRATIE DIRECTE PAR VOIE DE RÉFÉRENDUM MUNICIPAL

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 62, An Act to enact, amend and repeal various Acts in order to encourage direct democracy through municipal referendums, to provide additional tools to assist restructuring municipalities and to deal with other municipal matters / Projet de loi 62, Loi édictant, modifiant et abrogeant diverses lois en vue d'encourager la démocratie directe au moyen de référendums municipaux, de fournir des outils supplémentaires pour aider les municipalités restructurées et de traiter d'autres questions municipales.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1350 to 1355.*

**The Speaker:** All those in favour, please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan
Baird, John R.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Palladini, Al
Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Beaubien, Marcel	Harris, Michael D.	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Hastings, John	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Hudak, Tim	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Jackson, Cameron	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Johns, Helen	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Kells, Morley	Tilson, David
DeFaria, Carl	Klees, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Marland, Margaret	Turnbull, David
Ecker, Janet	Maves, Bart	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Brenda	Mazzilli, Frank	Witmer, Elizabeth
Flaherty, Jim	Molinari, Tina R.	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia	Young, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn	

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Bradley, James J.	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Churley, Marilyn	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sergio, Mario
Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David	Smitherman, George
Cordiano, Joseph		

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 47; the nays are 37.

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** We now have a deferred vote on the amendment to the motion relating to the Young Offenders Act, moved by Mr Bryant.

Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1359 to 1404.*

**The Speaker:** Mr Bryant has moved an amendment to the motion by Mr Klees relating to the Young Offenders Act.

All those in favour will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Boyer, Claudette	Gravelle, Michael	Parsons, Ernie
Bryant, Michael	Hampton, Howard	Patten, Richard
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Christopherson, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sergio, Mario
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce		

**The Speaker:** All those opposed?

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Palladini, Al
Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Beaubien, Marcel	Harris, Michael D.	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Johns, Helen	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Klees, Frank	Tilson, David
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Witmer, Elizabeth
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Young, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 37; the nays are 47.

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

On May 15, 2000, Mr Klees moved "that the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario,

"(a) Condemns the weakness of the current federal Young Offenders Act, and urges that it be scrapped and replaced with a tough new law that holds young criminals accountable for their actions;

"(b) Rejects the changes proposed by federal Bill C-3 because they do not go far enough to address the concerns of law-abiding citizens, but merely repackage the flawed, weak Young Offenders Act under a new name;

"(c) Further rejects any proposed amendments to Bill C-3 that would weaken and soften legislation that is already inadequate;

"(d) Particularly condemns the federal government's attempt, through its legislation, to shorten some jail sentences for crimes committed by young offenders;

"(e) Believes the 16- and 17-year-old persons charged with serious, adult-type offences should automatically be tried as adults; and

"(f) Believes that young people convicted of violent, adult-type crimes should be subject to adult-length sentences."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1409 to 1414.*

**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion by Mr Klees relating to the Young Offenders Act, please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Palladini, Al
Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Beaubien, Marcel	Harris, Michael D.	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Johns, Helen	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Klees, Frank	Tilson, David
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Witmer, Elizabeth
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Young, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	

**The Speaker:** Those opposed will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Hampton, Howard	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Christopherson, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Pupatello, Sandra
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	
Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 47; the nays are 37.

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek your clarification. I noted on that particular vote that the government's motion was read into the record prior to the vote and the opposition's

amendment was not read into the record. The amendment would have made the main motion acceptable. I wonder if you could explain that to us.

**The Speaker:** The reason is that when the motion was moved last Thursday it was at that time read into the record, and that's why it wasn't read in this time.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### SCHOOL EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question today is for the Premier. I, like you, would be aware that there are thousands and thousands of Ontario teachers who have dedicated themselves through extracurricular activities to their students, either through coaching sports or producing plays or leading their students on school trips. The question I want to put to you on their behalf is, why is it that you, through Bill 74, are about to recognize their collective devotion to their students, you are about to award their commitment, you are about to encourage their continuing involvement by telling them that if they stop those activities they will be punished?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think the minister can respond.

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education):** There are many teachers who provide extracurricular or co-instructional activities for students because they care about the students and because they see these as part of the job for their students. Parents certainly consider these important co-instructional activities, everything from parent-teacher nights to Remembrance Day ceremonies to coaching the football team, as very important services for their students.

Unfortunately, what we've seen in too many communities is that these activities have either been withdrawn completely or in part or there have been threats to do so as part of bargaining or political protest against a board or against the government.

Parents have been very clear that this is not a sustainable situation. I had said to the education sector many times that this was a problem that would either have to be dealt with by the sector or we, as the government, would have to respond to the parents' questions, and we have.

1420

**Mr McGuinty:** Minister, the only problem we have when it comes to participation in extracurricular activities is to be found in your riding. It is not wholesale. It is not widespread. This is not an issue for the overwhelming majority of ridings and parents and students and teachers. What you have done is taken a problem that is found in your riding and decided to apply a solution province-wide. This is micro-management gone mad. What you're doing through this bill, one more time, is sticking it to the

teachers. At the same time, you've decided to stick it to the trustees.

I believe that if we're going to deliver quality public education in Ontario, the only way we can possibly do that is by means of a working partnership, a partnership based on trust and mutual respect. Bill 74 drives a stake through the heart of any notion of trust and respect.

I'm asking you, on behalf of all of those teachers and on behalf of Ontario parents who are so intent on having, when it comes to our schools, peace in our time: Will you now withdraw your Bill 74?

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** First of all, would that it was only one community that had this problem. First of all, I reject the honourable member's somehow saying that only Durham had a problem, therefore somehow it wasn't a problem for the many thousands and thousands of students who were deprived of extracurricular activities, co-instructional activities, for two years. But it wasn't only in Durham region.

The other thing I'm very surprised about is that the honourable member says, "Withdraw Bill 74." Does that mean he's not in support of smaller class sizes, which is in Bill 74? Does that mean he's not in support of all the additional monies that are going into the system this fall as a result of Bill 74? Does that mean that if a school board were to take money meant for textbooks and spend it on something else, the honourable member is saying the government shouldn't be able to address that? If parents have a concern that a school board isn't meeting class size requirements, is he saying we shouldn't be able—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I'm afraid the minister's time is up. Final supplementary.

**Mr McGuinty:** If the minister today wants to introduce a bill which in a real way reduces class sizes, I want to assure her of our every bit of support for that kind of bill. As the minister knows full well, that's not what her Bill 74 is all about. It's based on the notion that the only way you're going to deliver education is by means of dictatorship, not partnership. It's not based on respect for teachers; it's based on disrespect for teachers. It's not based on trust; it's based on bullying. That's what your Bill 74 is all about.

If we are ever going to attract the best teachers into teaching, Minister, if we are ever going to attract the best trustees into taking on that office, then you have to understand that you are not going to be able to do that through your Bill 74.

I'm asking you again, on behalf of all those Ontarians who are genuinely committed to quality public education in Ontario, why don't you withdraw Bill 74 and instead introduce a separate bill that is going to reduce class sizes in Ontario?

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** Is it disrespectful of teachers to recognize in legislation that they do much more beyond simply standing in front of a classroom? That is very, very important. There are many teachers who do much more than that, and this legislation recognizes that. It also recognizes that parents have a role in deciding what kind



of extracurricular or co-instructional activities should be provided in their school. The legislation specifically recognizes that. I guess the honourable member doesn't think parents should have a role in deciding what extracurricular activities are happening in their community.

I had really hoped the parents and the students in our province were not going to be subjected to this end-of-civilization-as-we-know-it, over-the-hill rhetoric yet again, but unfortunately it appears to be the case. Bill 74 is based on many months of consultation with parents, with students, with teachers, with many people in the education sector.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):**

My question is for the Premier. Cancer Care Ontario's northeastern annual general meeting was supposed to begin tomorrow in Sudbury. It was cancelled at the last minute late last week. My understanding is that there were as many as 300 people who were eagerly looking forward to that meeting. These were cancer patients, members of their families, health care experts, all of whom were very interested in expressing their views about some of the shortcomings of cancer care in Ontario. Can you tell us why that meeting, which is of such great importance to those people concerning this issue, was cancelled at the last minute?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** The minister may know, Mr Speaker.

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I understand that was a decision that was made by Cancer Care Ontario. Obviously, they're the ones that have the information related to that decision.

**Mr McGuinty:** Let me tell you why that meeting was cancelled. It was cancelled because of your health care apartheid policy. Just so members fully understand this, and viewers as well, we're talking here about a system of compensation which clearly and effectively discriminates against cancer patients and their families who happen to reside in northern Ontario. If you are from the south and you have to leave your community to get treatment for your cancer, you receive compensation for your airfare, for your food, for your accommodation. But if you are from the north, all you get as a member of the family is 31 cents a kilometre—no compensation for food, no compensation for accommodation and no airfare. That's the discrimination I'm talking about here. That's why this meeting was cancelled. That's what these people want to talk about.

On their behalf I'm asking you today, Minister: Why will you not revoke, rescind and kill that discriminatory health care apartheid policy?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** The policy for re-referrals of cancer patients in the province of Ontario is the same whether you live in the north or the south or the east or the west. In fact, I have a letter here from Dr Ken Shumak, and he says:

"I understand that the government's decision on the recommendation of CCO to cover all travel and accommodation costs of cancer re-referral patients has resulted in a misperception that there is inequitable support for northern residents needing to travel for specialist care.

"As you know, the re-referral program covers only cancer patients who are re-referred for radiation treatment, and provides coverage of their travel and accommodation. This is a temporary program to ensure that those who need early radiation treatment can be treated in a timely manner."

He goes on to say, "I want to make it clear that patients who are re-referred for radiation treatment in Northern Ontario are—"

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. I'm afraid the minister's time is up. Final supplementary.

**Mr McGuinty:** If we ever needed proof that the Mike Harris Conservative Party has now become the government, we now have it here in spades. This is the Minister of Health, representing the government, who is telling us about some re-referral policy. I'm talking about something that has an impact on the ground which clearly discriminates against cancer patients and their families who happen to reside in northern Ontario.

The last time I checked, people in the north were paying the same by way of income taxes as people living in the south. The last time I checked, people in southern Ontario never passed their votes over to you, never elected this government in order that you might discriminate against people residing in northern Ontario.

So what I'm asking you now, Minister, is to stand up, stop thinking like the government for a minute, and start representing the interests of patients and families who happen to live in northern Ontario, and to rescind this health care apartheid policy.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I'm not sure why the leader who want to continue to present information which is not accurate and is misleading. People in the north have access to the northern health travel grant, plus they have access to the re-referral program that has been introduced by Cancer Care Ontario.

I don't know what part of this information the Leader of the Opposition does not get, but he is deliberately communicating information that is not accurate. There is equal access for every individual; plus, people in the north get the northern travel grant, which people in the south do not have access to.

1430

#### WALKERTON TRAGEDY

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Premier. This morning I met with a group of concerned citizens in Walkerton, and they asked me to raise a number of issues with you. When an ice storm hit eastern Ontario a few years ago, your government was able to put together a group of electrical workers from across Ontario, from across Canada and even from the United States. Two thousand Hydro workers

went to eastern Ontario. When Toronto was hit by a serious snowstorm a year and a half ago, you facilitated over 1,000 armed forces personnel coming into Toronto. What your government has told the people of Walkerton, who are dealing with polluted water, where tragically at least seven people have died, is that they must wait at least eight weeks to have their waterlines cleared.

Premier, can you tell me how it is that your government could do so much in the eastern Ontario ice storm and in the Toronto snowstorm, but you're telling people who are dealing with deaths and tragic illnesses that they must wait eight weeks before their waterline is cleared?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I am not telling them anything, nor should I. But in fact the Ontario Clean Water Agency is putting first and foremost the safety of every person of Walkerton. They are the ones who are setting the timelines. As far as we are concerned, they have all the resources available to them. We have sent personnel up into Walkerton, expertise not just into helping to clean up the system today but also to give us recommendations for the long term. We've opened a provincial office there now. We're working with the federal government and the local government in assisting with emergency aid, and I know they plan to embark upon fundraising, as other areas have. We've kick-started that, unlike any other emergency I think ever, including the ice storm. If there are additional resources that need to be available, they need only ask.

**Mr Hampton:** The people I met with are asking for the resources. You have Guelph university, which has some expertise on groundwater and surface water; you have the McMaster University medical school, which has a very strong public health department; you have the University of Western Ontario medical school, which has a very strong public health department. The fact is, the resources in Walkerton are very thin on the ground compared to the other examples I've cited. I'm asking, on behalf of the people of Walkerton, that your government do more, get more resources, get more expertise.

But they also raised another issue. They want to be assured that their voices are going to be heard in the commission of inquiry. They're asking for two things on that front: (1) that they have status at the inquiry, and (2) that intervener funding be set aside, sufficient so that they can be heard at the inquiry. I'm asking you for that commitment today as well, Premier.

**Hon Mr Harris:** I think the Attorney General could respond.

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** With respect to the procedure to be followed at the inquiry, I think the member knows, as a former Attorney General and as a lawyer, that the commissioner has broad scope to determine the procedure, and specifically with respect to those who are designated as interested parties that is a decision for the commissioner of the inquiry to make pursuant to section 5 of the Public Inquiries Act. It's not for me, with the greatest respect, or for anyone else here to dictate to the commissioner whom he has shall or shall

not designate as interested persons. That's provided for in the Public Inquiries Act. It's a statutory provision.

**Mr Hampton:** I beg to differ with the Attorney General. You do have the capacity. Since you are going to put together the terms of reference, you do have the capacity here and now to say that the people of Walkerton will have status before the public inquiry and that they will receive intervener funding so that they can make effective representations before the inquiry. You have that capacity here and now. Don't try to put that off on to the commissioner or commissioners down the road. That is your government's responsibility and I'm asking you to exercise that responsibility.

While I was there they asked me to make another point and that is this: They want to see a very broad-based commission of inquiry. They want to be assured that not only will the immediate questions surrounding Walkerton be answered but so will the greater questions concerning the safety of Ontario's water supply. What were the factors that could have contributed to this and what will be the steps necessary to ensure that this doesn't happen in Walkerton again, or in any other community again?

They want your commitment on that as well, Mr Attorney General. Will you give them that commitment?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** I have made it clear previously here, and the Premier has certainly made it clear, that the terms of reference are to be broad. I wrote to the leader of the official opposition and to the leader of the third party today confirming an independent, open and thorough public inquiry with respect to designating interested persons within section 5 of the Public Inquiries Act. That is a determination for the commissioner and not for anyone in this place, including me as Attorney General.

I would repeat to the Leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the third party that I need to have their comments as soon possible, immediately in fact, with respect to the terms of reference. I had a letter from the leader of the third party last week and I have some information from the Leader of the Opposition. If there is anything else that they'd like to put forward to have input with respect to the terms of reference, may I please have it immediately, within 24 hours or so, because the terms of reference are under active consideration and drafting now.

## WATER QUALITY

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** A question again for the Premier.

Last Thursday, I asked the Minister of the Environment to make water testing information available for all municipal water systems across the province because, in the wake of what has happened in Walkerton, people need to know if their water is safe or if there are problems with their water. Your Minister of the Environment said, "People should look at the ministry's Web site."

We looked at the ministry's Web site. It contains information only for 1996 and 1997. It's three years out

of date. It's incredible that he expects that that is sufficient in the aftermath of this tragedy.

Premier, that is totally unacceptable. Will you, in your position of responsibility, announce to the public of Ontario today that you are going to require the Minister of the Environment to make available immediately all of the current information on water testing for municipalities across the province? Will you make that commitment?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think we should go right to the source, the Minister of the Environment.

**Hon Dan Newman (Minister of the Environment):** Last Thursday I was asked a question regarding water reports, and the leader of the third party asked where he could go to get information. That's what he asked and I directed him to go to the ministry Web site. The ministry Web site has a lot of information on it, including a report, the drinking water surveillance program report from 1997. It does take time to compile these sorts of reports.

We saw just last week, for example, that another agency, the CEC, brought out a report which was based on the same year's data, 1997. It seemed to be fine for the leader of the third party to quote that report last week, but today it doesn't seem to be OK to quote a report from my ministry from 1997.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Supplementary.

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood):** I can't believe the games that you are playing today in response to a very serious question from my leader in the wake of Walkerton.

People need to know that their water is safe now, but they also need to know whether their water treatment plant is about to break down. We know, for instance, that in Walkerton the chlorination system had been having serious problems for some time.

Minister, I'll tell you, if this were happening in my town, I'd sure like to know what was going on. Will you—and I ask you again, Minister, don't play games with this issue as you did with the previous question; people of the province want peace of mind—immediately provide a current report on the condition of each of the province's water treatment plants today?

1440

**Hon Mr Newman:** Indeed, the member opposite should be well aware that Ontario's drinking water is 99.98% meeting the health-related objectives of the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. In fact, last Monday I made an announcement, and in that announcement I said that each and every certificate of approval would be reviewed for every water facility in this province. We're going to move forward with that and we're going to go further than that, because we're going to ensure that each and every certificate of approval for water facilities in this province is reviewed every three years from that point.

I also announced that labs will now have to be accredited and that any municipality or public utility that runs a water facility in this province will have to inform

the Ministry of the Environment of the change of any lab that may be doing services for them.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier. Last week in Ottawa I had the opportunity to visit a grade 5 class. During the course of the class, one of the students there asked me if I thought her drinking water was safe. This got me thinking, so over the course of the weekend we drafted a six-point emergency safe water action plan. It provides for the following; we need to do the following things: We need to have a complete inspection of every municipal water treatment facility by a qualified Ministry of the Environment inspector. We need the immediate release of the drinking water surveillance program reports for 1998 and 1999. We need to expand the water surveillance program to cover every municipal water plant. We need to restore tests for deadly bacteria such as E coli. We need a new law in Ontario to enforce every element of the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. Finally, we need the immediate release of the Galt report on intensive farming.

We find ourselves in an emergency crisis situation. I have put forward a six-point emergency safe water action plan, and I'm asking you, Premier, if you will follow through on my action plan.

**Hon Mr Harris:** I think the Minister of the Environment can answer that.

**Hon Mr Newman:** Last Monday I made an announcement regarding certificates of approval for water facilities in this province. In fact, each and every certificate of approval for any water facility in this province will be reviewed. We're going to go beyond that and ensure that once every three years water treatment facilities' certificates of approval are reviewed in this province.

I should note that under this government the number of municipalities or public utilities commissions that are partaking in the Ontario water surveillance program has actually increased, so we're seeing more public utilities and more municipalities choosing to become involved in this.

The member raises the issue of testing for E coli. It's important to note that municipalities and public utilities are already testing for that. Testing done through the drinking water surveillance program is normally only done two to six times per year. That's not enough to test for E coli. It should be done on a regular basis by municipalities and public utilities commissions.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, I have put forward a reasonable, responsible plan which is nothing less than absolutely essential in the circumstances. I can't understand why you didn't take the question and speak to it as Premier of Ontario. People everywhere in our province today are wondering about the safety of their own water supply. They're wondering why you haven't acted in a responsible way to address it through this kind of emergency plan. It is doable, it is cost-effective and it's the kind of thing we've got to do immediately.

By the way, speaking of costs, I've got some bad news for the Mike Harris government. If we're going to address safe water in Ontario, if we're going to make sure that all Ontarians have safe drinking water, we're going to have to spend some money. I don't apologize for making that request. You've cut back the budget by 40%; you let go one third of the staff. If you're going to execute on this kind of plan, you're going to need to hire at least 100 inspectors, and you need to hire them yesterday.

Again, Minister, I ask you, since the Premier refuses to deal with this, will you deliver on this six-point emergency water safety plan?

**Hon Mr Newman:** In fact, this government brought forward the provincial water protection fund, which was going to be over a three-year period. That money was accelerated so that municipalities could have access to that money over a two-year period because we thought that would be the best way to help municipalities.

But I have to ask this of the Leader of the Opposition. On May 26 in Midland, Ontario, you were quoted as wanting a legislative committee to review this situation. I brought forward a motion last Monday calling for a legislative committee that would be able to travel, just as the Leader of the Opposition wanted, and he voted against that. Now I ask him—he brings forward this idea today—is he going to change his mind tomorrow?

#### ANIMAL PROTECTION

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** My question is directed to the Solicitor General.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I can't hear. There's a new question, and the member for Northumberland now has the floor.

Sorry for the interruption. Member for Northumberland.

**Mr Galt:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I was having difficulty hearing myself.

My constituents and the people across this province are concerned with animal cruelty. People are absolutely horrified by some of the awful incidents of cats being mutilated and dogs being dragged behind trucks. A good example of that was in my riding last summer when Nikita was dragged. Anyone found guilty of animal cruelty must receive more than just a slap on the wrist. My constituents in Northumberland and the people of Ontario want to see stronger penalties for those who are cruel to animals.

Minister, could you tell the House what our government is doing to combat animal cruelty?

**Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Solicitor General):** I'd like to thank the member for Northumberland for the question. First of all I might say that cruelty to animals is totally unacceptable in this province. I've met several times with the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and they have indicated that what they need here in this province is some assistance in

terms of training of their inspectors so they can better enforce the laws against cruelty to animals. I'm proud to say the OSPCA has actually carried out on their own already the increase in the training for their inspectors to five days from two.

But I'm really proud to say that just recently, on May 24, at a groundbreaking in the great riding of the Honourable Frank Klees, who was there with me, we were able to present to the OSPCA a cheque for \$154,000 to assist the OSPCA in the training of their inspectors. This is important to them, because I think all of us here do understand and believe that cruelty to animals is not acceptable.

**Mr Galt:** Back in November, I received a letter from the federal justice minister regarding animal cruelty. She informed me at that time that in the very near future she intended to improve the law in this very important area. Following this, the media soon reported that the government was going to update the animal cruelty laws. These laws have remained largely unchanged since 1892, over a century. However, the federal Liberals have run into some problems with their proposed changes because they didn't consult with all their stakeholders. As a result, changes to the Criminal Code to strengthen penalties against those who are cruel to animals may not indeed become a reality. The federal Liberals are attempting to move forward on this important matter, but now they've almost ruined that opportunity.

Minister, could you tell the House what your position is on this lack of decision on the part of the federal government?

**Hon Mr Tsubouchi:** First of all, I'm really not surprised at the fact that the federal Liberals are making commitments or promises. That doesn't surprise me. I'd be greatly surprised if in fact they actually carried through on a promise or two.

Back on August 25, I wrote to Anne McLellan, who is the justice minister, and asked her, on behalf of the people of Ontario, to increase the fines and jail times for people who are cruel to animals, and said also that if anyone is guilty of abusing an animal they should face the real possibility of not owning a pet for life.

I understand the Liberals have made these promises. I understand as well they've hit a rut in the road to these Liberal promises and have veered off the road, not surprisingly.

1450

#### ONTARIO REALTY CORP

**Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East):** My question is to the Premier. I want to ask you about a land deal with the Ontario Realty Corp involving E.C. Drury Park in Milton.

In May 1988, before this property was going to become surplus, your government, through the ORC, accepted a cheque for \$25,000 as a deposit. On July 8, within 24 hours of the town of Milton saying they had no interest in the property, another cheque of \$188,000 was

accepted from the same developer toward the purchase of the property. When I questioned your minister, the Chair of the Management Board, about two months ago, he said the deal was being reviewed: clearly a bad deal, clearly a deal that did not follow the procedures of the ORC.

Premier, as of last week, on May 31, the ORC once again extended the deadline for closure of this deal. They didn't withdraw it, they didn't shut the deal down; they once again extended the deadline for closure. Can you explain to the House why it's in the best interests of the taxpayers for this to occur?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** No, I can't. I'd be glad to get the answer. I assume it's still under review.

**Mr Agostino:** The situation gets worse, actually. The deal itself was conditional on the OMB approving a zoning change on behalf of the developer. So you're guaranteeing automatically a value increase in property, and the developer can get out of the deal if he doesn't get the zoning change he wants. That is not in the best interests of taxpayers, Premier.

It gets even better. The ORC is refusing to reveal publicly how much was offered for this taxpayers' property, owned by the taxpayers of Ontario. The Ontario Realty Corp will not publicly reveal how much the deal was for. The ORC staffer at that time who was handling the deal was a Mr Vince Catalfo, who is now under investigation for a number of other deals involving the ORC when he was a staff member.

In view of all this evidence, Premier, instead of walking hand in hand with the developer to try to help them through the OMB and increase the property, which was not properly tendered, was not broadly tendered—clearly the ORC procedure was not being followed; the gentleman involved has been involved in a number of questionable deals now under investigation at the ORC. Again, can you please explain to the House why you should not revoke this deal today?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Because it is up to the ORC and now the independent auditors that have been called in, and thank goodness we have a minister who called them in, to approve or disapprove any of these deals. If you're saying you don't have confidence in the independent auditors—I thought you would have—that's why they were called in.

## CURRICULUM

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** My question is for the Minister of Education. I have heard from many of my constituents, both parents and students, that it is vitally important that the students of today be ready to successfully compete in the global economy. It is the responsibility of the public education system to prepare our students for the world that exists when they leave high school. I know the students in my riding who I have talked to have many different destinations planned for when they leave high school, but one thing remains constant: They want to be successful, whichever avenue they choose.

Minister, last Friday you released the province's new grade 11 and grade 12 curriculum. How will this new curriculum come to ensure that students are indeed prepared for whichever destination they choose following high school?

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education):** First of all, changing the curriculum, making it more rigorous, making it better reflect what students needed to learn, whether they were going to university or to college or directly into the workplace, was a promise we made to the voters before both the 1995 and 1999 elections, to move forward with making a better curriculum. We have indeed delivered on that promise. The new curriculum has our students learning more in earlier grades, learning more of what they need to succeed at university, at college or in the workplace. It has involved hundreds of teachers, educators, parents. It has just been a massive and incredibly intense and very productive consultation exercise to write all of the new curriculum documents, and I thank all of the individuals who were involved in this.

I'd like to also say that we've released this grades 11 and 12 curriculum, and it's a full year ahead of when grade 11 will actually start.

**Mr Stewart:** I'm proud to see this government is committed to improving the publicly funded education system. Indeed, I am very proud, and I feel confident that the students in my riding will benefit from the education reforms of this government.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stewart:** I hope they learn not to speak when other people are talking, too.

An improved curriculum, teacher testing, student-focused funding and a code of conduct for all Ontario schools are highlights of the education reforms that we have committed to and depend upon.

Minister, my constituents believe that a student's education should be well-rounded and include many subjects, from math to history. Can you tell my constituents where emphasis is placed in this new curriculum?

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** We've spent a considerable amount of time listening to what those in colleges and universities and employers said that our young people needed to know before they left high school so that they could succeed. The new curriculum very much responds to that, with the advice of hundreds of teachers and educators and parents who were part of this. It provides a very solid foundation in English, sciences and math courses. It has a new emphasis on Canadian history and civics, something that we heard very clearly needed to be done. There is much more emphasis on technology programs, on life skills that students need to know in order to succeed. It is very much focused on helping our young people succeed, not only in the workplace but also as individuals in the community. It really has been a wonderful opportunity to improve the curriculum.

We've followed this up. In the 11-12 curriculum, there will be some \$200 million going out to assist teachers—

**The Speaker:** The minister's time is up.

## IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** I have a question for the Premier. Premier, for five years you have been stonewalling against requests for a public inquiry into the death of Dudley George at Ipperwash. You have said, time and time again, that a public inquiry cannot happen until the criminal proceedings are completed and any civil legal proceedings are completed.

Last week, after the Walkerton tragedy, you were forced to do the right thing and call a public inquiry into the events at Walkerton and the safety of Ontario's water supply, despite the fact that there's an ongoing criminal investigation and civil legal proceedings are about to commence.

Premier, you have absolutely no excuse for refusing a public inquiry into the death of Dudley George. You have no leg to stand on. Premier, when will you call a public inquiry into the death of Dudley George?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think the Attorney General can respond.

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** The incident at Ipperwash of course was a tragedy. As the member opposite knows, there are two outstanding criminal matters still pending in Ontario arising out of the situation at Ipperwash. As you know, there are no criminal charges arising out of the incidents and events at Walkerton. That's a pretty serious difference that I'm sure a former Attorney General would understand—the difference between a criminal appeal on its way to the Supreme Court of Canada, which we have in the Ipperwash situation, and another criminal charge that has been dealt with by the Ontario Court of Appeal but I believe we're still within the appeal period to launch an appeal with the Supreme Court of Canada—very basic differences.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** By way of supplementary, first of all I'm disappointed that the Premier chose not to answer that question, even on a day when we have a number of native leaders here in the Assembly itself on other issues that they're trying to get your government to deal with, and you guys don't even want to move.

On the issue, to the Attorney General as a follow-up, you say because there are criminal charges you can't move. I want to quote something that was said by the Premier last week when commenting on the Walkerton situation. He said: "I think the committee ought to be able to get started right away and be able to deal with information right away. Even if there are criminal charges or other court actions...."

So the question to you simply is this: If it was OK for the Premier last week to move on the issue of Walkerton, why is it that you don't want, on this day, to deal with what happened in Ipperwash and call for a public inquiry?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** I would remind the member opposite that in the Ipperwash situation, the appellant Ontario Provincial Police officer has appealed the Court

of Appeal dismissal of the appeal of conviction to the Supreme Court of Canada. That appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada is pending and has not yet been heard. As that matter is still before the courts, I'll say nothing additional about that.

In the other criminal matter arising out of Ipperwash, the Ontario Court of Appeal reserved its decision on July 8, 1999, and subsequently rendered its decision. As I indicated in response to the previous question, I believe the time for appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada has not yet expired with respect to that criminal matter. There are fundamental differences.

1500

GRANDVIEW TRAINING SCHOOL  
FOR GIRLS

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** My question is for the Premier. Sitting in the west gallery are three survivors of the Grandview-Galt school for girls tragedy: Donna Lee, Linda McNeil, and her daughter, Heather Fudge. They, and the official opposition, want you to release the internal investigative report undertaken by the government of Ontario in 1976 on the Grandview-Galt school for girls. Will you release this report now so that the full story can be told about this horrible tragedy at Grandview-Galt?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** That should appropriately be addressed by the Attorney General.

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** In response to the question from the member for St Paul's, as he may not know—and he should know this—there are ongoing police investigations with respect to the very serious, tragic occurrences at Grandview. In those circumstances of ongoing police investigations, it is inappropriate and it would be inappropriate to release the report. Indeed, this matter has been dealt with, as the member may or may not know, by the Ontario Court of Appeal in 1993 or so. When a freedom-of-information application had been made, the director of the Archives of Ontario, as I understand it, declined the application; that was appealed to Divisional Court and the Court of Appeal. Ultimately, the Ontario Court of Appeal indicated that it would not be appropriate to release the report, given the criminal matters that were proceeding at that time. I say to the member now that he should know these criminal investigations are ongoing.

**Mr Bryant:** I can't believe it. In 1976 this report is completed. The culpability of the government of the day has never been addressed. The survivors were told that after the apology was given by the Attorney General, myself and the leader of the third party, at that time the report could be released and the story could be told. There are women who are in their 80s. They are going to die before the full story is told.

I'm not the first one to ask for this report to be divulged. Another Attorney General critic asked for this report to be divulged, in 1994. He said, "This report

should come out now.” He said, “The public is entitled to know something.” Who am I talking about? Your predecessor, Charles Harnick. Will you release the report, or are you going to continue to cover this up?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** I’ve already indicated to the member opposite that there are ongoing police investigations, and that of course is an important matter.

I’ll say this also to the member opposite. I met with the Grandview survivors at the time I made the apology in this place on behalf of all of us in this Legislative Assembly in a very, very serious and tragic situation that had many victims. One message was very clear from the victims with whom I met, and that is that they want the persons brought to justice, to criminal justice, who were responsible for these activities. That is what the police are trying to do. I would think the member opposite would want the police to do their job and take as long as it takes to do it properly on behalf of the survivors of Grandview.

#### EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

**Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe):** My question is for the minister responsible for children. Last fall, you announced five early years demonstration projects to test and build upon several different approaches to supporting good early childhood development and parenting. One of the five sites is located in my community of London. Could you please tell us more about the demonstration projects?

**Hon Margaret Marland (Minister without Portfolio [Children]):** I’d like to thank Frank Mazzilli, the member for London-Fanshawe, for his interest in our continuing support for Ontario’s young children and their families.

These demonstration sites are very important and they are very valuable. We have committed \$1.7 million over the next 18 months to these projects. The early years task group, which we announced very recently, will advise our government on the key elements for a province-wide program. They will deliver a final report to me by April of next year.

This fall our government will launch the early years challenge fund. This fund will grow to \$30 million next year and will match contributions from business, voluntary and charitable sectors to support early child development and parenting programs in our communities. The early years are crucial to helping children reach their full potential, and we are firmly committed to creating that program.

**Mr Mazzilli:** My constituents certainly appreciate it. As you can appreciate, my riding of London-Fanshawe is filled with hospitals, and the federal Liberals have cut health care funding and presently only fund 10% of health care, which is an important issue.

Minister, can you be more specific on the issue of the early years project in other ridings?

**Hon Mrs Marland:** All five of these demonstration projects have made substantial progress. They have

established unique leadership models with broad-based representation while securing financial commitments from local businesses, service clubs, charitable and voluntary sectors.

These early years demonstration projects are also broadening public awareness on the importance of early child development and parenting. Investing in Children is the name of the program in London and it’s one of these five projects. They have held successful business community breakfasts and have identified specific ways to support the early years initiatives in 13 London neighbourhoods.

I’m very excited about the outstanding progress of these projects, and I’m proud of Premier Harris’s vision for our children in this province.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury):** My question is for the Minister of Health. Last Friday at 3 pm, the appointed board at Cancer Care Ontario shut down the annual CCOR meeting to be held in Sudbury because your government has no answers to the questions northern cancer patients were going to ask about your travel policy.

No matter how you spin it, Minister, I suggest to you that a cancer patient who has to travel for care is a cancer patient who has to travel for care. It’s as simple as that. A person living in Smooth Rock Falls who has to travel 395 kilometres to Sudbury for treatment receives \$122. A person from Toronto who has to travel 390 miles to Sudbury for care receives return airfare, all meals and all accommodation costs. Do you believe that the cancer patient travelling from Smooth Rock Falls is being treated with the same fairness as the cancer patient who has to travel from Toronto?

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** The member is doing the same thing as his leader did earlier. He is deliberately trying to confuse the issue.

Let’s understand very clearly that when we talk about the Cancer Care Ontario program, the re-referral program covers only cancer patients who are re-referred for radiation treatment. This is a temporary program to ensure that those who need early radiation treatment can be treated in a timely manner. There is no inequitable treatment between people in any part of this province. They all receive the same type of care and support.

The northern health travel grant program is a permanent program as the member knows. It is designed to assist any resident of northern Ontario who must travel a distance for medical care. As the member knows, the two programs have been designed for two—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I’m afraid the minister’s time is up. Supplementary.

1510

**Mr Bartolucci:** The rhetoric really is meaningless here, because you’re avoiding the issue. Minister, cancer patients and their families are fighting the toughest

battles of their lives. Those living in northern Ontario are embattled twice: once by the illness they are fighting and the second battle through your government's inequity in the travel policy.

Instead of fixing the problems you have with your health care apartheid and solving the problem, here is what you've done: You didn't reappoint Gerry Loughheed Jr chair of the northeast regional CCOR, probably the most knowledgeable volunteer for cancer care in Ontario, because he chose to tell the truth about your policy. You cancelled the June 6 annual meeting, effectively shutting down democracy for those people who wanted to explain to your official. Your bias convinced Mr René Boucher from Iroquois Falls to file a discrimination complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Finally, you forced 23 cancer victims to join forces with me in exploring the possibility of launching a class action lawsuit.

My question to the minister is simple: When will you accept responsibility for this health care apartheid and, more importantly, why will you not fix it?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I guess my question to the member opposite is, why would he deliberately mislead people?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I've got it. The minister can't say that. I'd ask that she withdraw that.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I would withdraw.

Why would the member not acknowledge that there are two programs? He is trying to indicate that they are used for the same purpose. There is a re-referral program that has been introduced by Cancer Care Ontario which supports all people in the province, and there is a northern travel grant. The two programs are designed to meet different purposes and they are designed to meet different needs. For whatever reason, the member is confusing the two programs. Perhaps he really doesn't understand the difference.

#### PROBATION AND PAROLE SERVICES

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** This is for the Minister of Correctional Services. Recently, articles in the press have been appearing claiming Ontario has a very poor probation system. In fact, an Ottawa judge claimed that the probation system was unable to provide proper supervision, and the judge instead imposed a 60-day intermittent jail sentence.

Lately, judges have echoed probation and parole officers' concerns that funding for community corrections is inadequate and putting public safety at risk. Probation officers in my riding of Durham have been echoing the same comments.

Minister, what is correctional services doing to address the probation and parole officers' concerns about high caseload?

**Hon Rob Sampson (Minister of Correctional Services):** I too have been reading the reports of members from the bench who have been commenting about

particular cases before them. I too in fact have met with the Probation Officers Association of Ontario to talk about probation and parole in this province.

What I'm hearing from those two groups and from the people of this province is that they are concerned, as I am, that we need to have an effective and, frankly, a much more disciplined probation and parole system in this province. That is what we are intending to do. In fact, we were committing to that when the Minister of Finance stood up in this House just last month—I think it was almost this day a month ago—on the budget, the first time this province has had a balanced budget in years. He stood up and committed that we would hire, through extra funding for this ministry, additional probation and parole officers to help deal with the very difficult caseload—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I'm afraid the minister's time is up.

**Mr O'Toole:** Thank you very much for that very thorough response. I like the way you related it to the budget. The Minister of Correctional Services has committed to improving the Ontario correctional system, and I feel confident that you're just the right person for the job.

I'm aware of intermittent sentencing authorized as a sentencing option for judges throughout the federal criminal system. It is my understanding that intermittent sentencing contributes to the workload of jail staff on weekends and is a source of contraband, such as drugs and alcohol, being smuggled into institutions. Minister, what steps are you taking to put an end to intermittent sentencing in our jails?

**Hon Mr Sampson:** The member from Durham is always quite insightful; in fact, he's very insightful when he wants to speak about the challenges of intermittent sentencing. All three justice ministers in this province have written to the federal justice minister asking her to pass legislation in the House of Parliament in this country to get rid of intermittent sentencing. But like our request to deal with tough and effective young offenders' legislation, like our request to deal with probation and conditional sentencing, like our request to deal with young offenders who are committing serious and violent offences, it's fallen on deaf Liberal ears up there. They have no intention of paying attention to a get-tough-on-crime program in this country. Why? We don't know. We need to deal with intermittent sentencing because it is providing a very difficult challenge for our correctional officers in this province who have to deal with individuals—

**The Speaker:** Order. I'm afraid the minister's time is up. New question.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** I have a question for the Premier. Your government is doing whatever it can to try and silence those critics of your government's discrimination against northern cancer patients. You are



dumping Gerry Lougheed Jr from the Cancer Care Ontario board because he dared name the situation for what it is, which is health care apartheid. Your chair of Cancer Care Ontario, Peter Crossgrove, reportedly said at Friday's emergency meeting that you, Premier, were very upset with how this issue has been publicized, sending a clear message to other board members on how to vote to cancel tomorrow's regional meeting. You also seem to be completely unwilling to intervene to ensure that the annual meeting of the northeastern Cancer Care Ontario regional council will take place tomorrow so that northern Ontario cancer patients will have an opportunity to have their say.

For 14 long months now, your government has paid all of the costs for southern Ontario cancer patients who have to travel far from home for cancer care. You did this upon recommendation from CCO, who argued it was necessary because, and I quote, "These patients would not normally have to travel long distances for their treatment."

Every day, northern cancer patients have to travel far from home for treatment in Sudbury and Thunder Bay. They have to leave the north for treatment in Toronto and Ottawa, and still your government refuses to deal with this discrimination, with this inequity. Your Minister of Finance and your Minister of Health said one month ago that this situation would be reviewed. When are you going to end this discrimination against northern cancer patients?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think you've heard from the minister very well that there is no discrimination. This is not an Ontario government program like the northern health travel grant. This has been brought forward by Cancer Care Ontario itself. I'm not aware of a meeting that was to take place, nor of the cancellation of a meeting. That is up to Cancer Care Ontario itself.

In addition to the Cancer Care commitment of full expenses to be paid if somebody from the north has to go to the south or somebody from the south has to go to the north, of course there is the northern travel grant that only those in northern Ontario have. In fact, people in southern Ontario don't have that program.

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In 1994-95, the NDP government transferred \$200 million to the Ontario Clean Water Agency. On May 31, 2000, the Minister of the Environment said it was an NDP cut. I'm asking for unanimous consent to allow the Minister of the Environment an opportunity—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. Would the member take her seat.

Is there unanimous consent? No. All members know that a member can change their own record at any period in time.

1520

## PETITIONS

### EDUCATION LEGISLATION

**Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury):** This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 74 diminishes quality education for all students in this province by ensuring teachers will be responsible for more students each day and will therefore have less time for each student; and

"Whereas Bill 74 attacks the very heart of local democracy and accountability by creating a system of informers and absolute power for the Minister of Education;

"Whereas Bill 74 cuts not only the heart out of education but also the spirit by making teachers perform voluntary activities on threat of termination;

"Whereas Bill 74 is an unprecedented attack on the collective bargaining rights of Ontario's teachers; and

"Whereas Bill 74 turns over all control over education in this province to one person, the Minister of Education; and

"Whereas we believe only one-and-a-half days of public hearings is both a sham and a shame;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We call on the government to hold" full "public hearings on Bill 74" across the province "immediately."

I affix my signature to this petition as I'm in agreement with it and give it to Maria Dombrowsky to bring to the table.

### CAMPING

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I have here a petition signed by a number of people from the Schumacher-Timmins area in regard to the banning of camping in northern Ontario, down to 21 days cumulatively for any particular camper, something which I think is absolutely ridiculous. It reads as follows:

"To the Parliament/Legislative Assembly:

"We, the undersigned, want our camping back for all summer, as it was previously, working under the Ministry of Natural Resources with an elected associate and stewards. Camping for only 21 days in a year is not justified at our campground as we have never experienced any problems in the past and have taken great care to meet and exceed all of the ministry's demands on us.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament/Legislative Assembly of Ontario" to stop the discrimination against campers.

I affix my signature to this petition.

## OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** It is my pleasure to present a petition as quickly as I can here. I was speaking this morning with Josie Watts, who lives in Wilmot Creek, and she echoed her support for this petition as well.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Oak Ridges moraine is a glacial ridge running across the top of Toronto including Caledon, King, Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Whitchurch-Stouffville, Uxbridge, Pickering, Scugog, Whitby, Oshawa and Clarington; and

"Whereas the Oak Ridges moraine is the headwater for about 35 rivers and streams flowing south to Lake Ontario and north to Lake Simcoe; and

"Whereas the drinking water for millions of GTA residents, the wetlands, wildlife and natural areas will suffer irreparable damage if industrial, commercial and/or residential development is permitted without protective planning for preservation,

"We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario will:

"Do everything in its power to ensure the Oak Ridges moraine remains zoned as agricultural and rural;

"Work with the Ontario Municipal Board to ensure conservation of the Oak Ridges moraine;

"Provide a policy statement to enshrine its position."

I'm pleased to support this petition and read it today.

## MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** People in my constituency are very unhappy about the amalgamation of Beardmore, Longlac, Geraldton and Nakina into one large municipality. I have petitions from thousands of people. If I may, I'll read the petitions from the town of Longlac right now.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the corporation of the town of Longlac is an incorporated municipality; and

"Whereas the act provides for the amalgamation of towns and townships for economic purposes; and

"Whereas the province has implemented legislation creating district social services area boards and area services boards; and

"Whereas area services boards have taxing authority; and

"Whereas the economic justification for the creation of Greenstone no longer exists; and

"Whereas the residents of the town of Longlac would like to continue to live in the municipality known as the corporation of the town of Longlac;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to ensure that the corporation of the town of Longlac continues to be a separate municipality in the province of Ontario."

We have over 600 signatures from Longlac and many more that I want to read later from other communities such as Beardmore, Jellicoe and Nakina.

## EDUCATION LEGISLATION

**Mr Bob Wood (London West):** I have a petition signed by 113 people. It calls on the government to hold public hearings on Bill 74 immediately.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** Further petitions.

**Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** My petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Bill 74 diminishes quality education for students in this province by ensuring teachers will be responsible for more students each day and will therefore have less time for each student;

"Whereas Bill 74 attacks the very heart of local democracy and accountability by creating a system of informers and absolute powers for the Minister of Education;

"Whereas Bill 74 cuts not only the heart out of education but also the spirit by making teachers perform voluntary activities on threat of termination;

"Whereas Bill 74 is an unprecedented attack on the collective bargaining rights of Ontario teachers; and

"Whereas Bill 74 turns over all control over education in this province to one person, the Minister of Education;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We call on the government to hold public hearings on Bill 74 immediately."

I'm very happy to add my name to this petition.

## OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** At the risk of repeating myself, I'm going to read the petition again. I've got a number of these. Gwen Meraw has brought these to my attention. She's with the Catholic Women's League at St Joseph's in Bowmanville.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Oak Ridges moraine is a glacial ridge running across the top of Toronto including Caledon, King, Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Whitchurch-Stouffville, Uxbridge, Pickering, Scugog, Whitby, Oshawa and Clarington"—most of which is in my riding—"and

"Whereas the Oak Ridges moraine is the headwater for about 35 rivers and streams flowing south to Lake Ontario and north to Lake Simcoe; and

"Whereas the drinking water for millions of GTA residents, the wetlands, wildlife and natural areas will suffer irreparable damage if industrial, commercial and/or residential development is permitted without protective planning for preservation,

"We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario will:

“Do everything in its power to ensure the Oak Ridges moraine remains zoned as agricultural and rural;

“Work with the Ontario Municipal Board to ensure conservation of the Oak Ridges moraine;

“Provide a policy statement to enshrine its position.”

I support this petition, and I will sign my name to it.

#### CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming-Cochrane):** I have a substantial petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the government of Ontario has stated its intention to close the Monteith Correctional Centre; and

“Whereas this closure will result in the loss of 90 jobs in Iroquois Falls and the surrounding area; and

“Whereas this job loss will be devastating to the community,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

“We call upon the government of Ontario to cease plans to close the Monteith Correctional Centre and continue to publicly operate this facility.”

I have affixed my signature to this.

#### PENSION FUNDS

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Ministry of Health announced a new model on January 25, 1996, for improving and coordinating long-term care services. The amalgamation of the home care and placement coordination services function did shift to community care access centres (CCACs). The governing bodies of various pension plans, namely the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement Savings (OMERS), Victorian Order of Nurses (VON), Family Services Association (FSA) and Hospital of Ontario Pension Plan (HOOPP) have failed to successfully negotiate agreements for a transfer of pension assets.

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the pension adjustments are a transition item which the ministry has not yet addressed. We are requesting a one-time adjustment to enable the transfer of pension assets. This transfer is required to ensure that employees transferred from predecessor employers (namely health units and the Victorian Order of Nurses) to community care access centres as part of the mandatory government reform initiative for ‘single access to long-term-care services’ receive pension benefits equal to those which they formerly enjoyed. Provincially over 3,000 health care workers are affected. The individuals who transferred to the CCACs had no control over what would happen to their prior pension contributions. Unless a one-time adjustment is made to enable the transfer of reserves, the typical employee will lose about \$2,000 annually in pension benefits compared to the position

they would have been in had they been allowed to remain in OMERS.”

I affix my signature to this petition.

#### HEALTH CARE FUNDING

**Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a petition relating to health care, signed by about 250 constituents.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Canada’s health care system is one of our greatest achievements as a country;

“Whereas health care in Ontario has deteriorated, with medical services being reduced and hospital budgets cut to the bone, resulting in lengthy delays in treatment, with sometimes fatal results;

“Whereas major changes in health care legislation by the Harris government have been made with no prior public consultation;

“Whereas residents of Prince Edward-Hastings are demanding that their voices be heard and their concerns addressed to ensure that future health care legislation meets their needs;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to call on the Harris government to protect our valued health care system and to hold public hearings on Bills 23 and 173.”

These petitions combined with earlier ones I believe total about 1,200 names, and being in complete agreement, I am pleased to add my name to this petition.

1530

#### EDUCATION LEGISLATION

**Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East):** I have a petition.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Bill 74 diminishes quality education for students in this province by ensuring teachers will be responsible for more students each day and will therefore have less time for each student;

“Whereas Bill 74 attacks the very heart of local democracy and accountability by creating a system of informers and absolute powers for the Minister of Education;

“Whereas Bill 74 cuts not only the heart out of education but also the spirit by making teachers perform voluntary activities on threat of termination;

“Whereas Bill 74 is an unprecedented attack on the collective bargaining rights of Ontario’s teachers; and

“Whereas Bill 74 turns over all control over education in this province to one person, the Minister of Education;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“We call on the government to hold public hearings on Bill 74 immediately.”

### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming-Cochrane):** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the northern health travel grant was introduced in 1987 in recognition of the fact that northern Ontario residents are often forced to receive treatment outside their own communities because of the lack of available services; and

“Whereas the Ontario government acknowledged that the costs associated with that travel should not be fully borne by those residents and therefore that financial support should be provided by the Ontario government through the travel grant program; and

“Whereas travel, accommodation and other costs have escalated sharply since the program was first put in place, particularly in the area of air travel; and

“Whereas the Ontario government has provided funds so that southern Ontario patients needing care at the Northwestern Ontario Cancer Centre have all their expenses paid while receiving treatment in the north which creates a double standard for health care in the province; and

“Whereas northern Ontario residents should not receive a different level of health care nor be discriminated against because of their geographical locations;

“Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Ontario, petition the Ontario Legislative Assembly to acknowledge the unfairness and inadequacy of the northern health travel grant program and commit to a review of the program with a goal of providing 100% funding of the travel costs for residents needing care outside their communities until such time as that care is available in our communities.”

I affix my signature to this.

### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas 13 people died during the first seven months of 1999 on Highway 401 between London and Windsor; and

“Whereas traffic levels on all sections of Highway 401 continue to increase; and

“Whereas Canada’s number one trade and travel route was designed in the 1950s for fewer vehicles and lighter trucks; and

“Whereas road funding is almost completely paid through vehicle permit and driver licensing fees; and

“Whereas Ontario road users pay 28 cents per litre of tax on gasoline, adding up to over \$2.7 billion in provincial gas taxes and over \$2.3 billion in federal gas taxes;

“We, the undersigned members of the Canadian Automobile Association and other residents of Ontario, respectfully request the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately upgrade Highway 401 to at least a six-lane highway with full paved shoulders and rumble strips; and

“We respectfully request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario place firm pressure on the federal government to invest its gasoline tax revenue in road safety improvements in Ontario.”

This is signed by a number of residents in Chatham, and I affix my signature to it.

### MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** I have other petitions of communities opposed to the amalgamation of Beardmore, Jellicoe, Nakina, Geraldton and Longlac into one huge community called Greenstone. I’ll read now the petitions from the township of Beardmore, and we have hundreds of people who have signed petitions.

“Whereas the corporation of the township of Beardmore is an incorporated municipality; and

“Whereas the corporation of the township of Beardmore has continued to operate in a fiscally responsible manner as a community in its own right since 1945; and

“Whereas amalgamation with other distant communities could prove to be detrimental to the individualistic and financial lifestyle associated with living in the township of Beardmore; and

“Whereas the economic justification for the creation of Greenstone no longer exists, and its creation may result in a loss of local services and an increased tax burden on the residents of Beardmore; and

“Whereas the residents of the township of Beardmore would like to continue to be the municipality known as the corporation of the township of Beardmore;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to ensure that the corporation of the township of Beardmore continues to be a separate municipality in the province of Ontario.”

I am pleased to sign my name to that petition.

### OPPOSITION DAY

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I move the following motion:

That this House recognizes this government has abandoned responsibility for protecting our environment, resulting in the Walkerton E coli disaster, 1,800 deaths a year from air pollution, polluters not being prosecuted, and Ontario becoming the third-worst polluter in North America; and that this House demands that the government finally take action on this serious problem by:

(1) Beginning to restore the 40% cut to the budget of the Ministry of the Environment; and

(2) Beginning to restore the one third of Ministry of the Environment staff that the government has laid off; and

(3) Beginning to get tough with the polluters of Ontario.

It is the Minister of the Environment we wish to do that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** Mr Bradley moves opposition day number five.

**Mr Bradley:** I wish I didn't have to make this address to the House this afternoon, because I wish the tragedy in Walkerton never did happen. The fact is that the tragedy in Walkerton was a crisis just waiting to happen. Whenever you place the province at great risk in one way or another by government abandoning its traditional and important responsibility, you then put the province at risk. That is exactly what has happened with our drinking water. Regrettably, it has taken the deaths of at least seven people—that's at least seven that today can be attributed to the drinking of water with E coli in it; perhaps there are more—and hundreds of people who are seriously ill in Walkerton to focus attention on the issue of the safety of drinking water in Ontario.

This, in my view, is a defining moment for the Harris administration and for the Common Sense Revolution. Those of us in the opposition, certainly we in the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party, environment groups across this province and independent adjudicators of the environmental scene have warned this government time and again, indeed people within the ministry itself have warned this government, that it is placing our environment, the health and safety of people and of other life in the province in jeopardy with massive cuts to the Ministry of the Environment, massive cuts to the Ministry of Health and massive cuts to the Ministry of Natural Resources, and also to the Ministry of Agriculture. All of these in one way or another have a role to play in protecting the environment, as indeed all ministries do.

For years this has been brought to the attention of this government. When conservation authorities were cut, people said, "Well, they can do without the funding." What they forgot was that conservation authorities have a lot to do with surface water management. We know that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food would like to address the issue of groundwater problems and runoff that goes into our waters. This has been postponed. This has been pushed into the background. There have been cuts to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

But what has been most appalling has been that over 40% of the budget of the Ministry of the Environment and about one third of the staff have been cut, these people sent out the door. These are scientists, these are technicians, these are people who do the actual paperwork. It may seem tedious and unimportant, but it is exceedingly important. These are technicians in laboratories; these are people who are involved in environmental assessment; these are legal people; these are inspectors; these are investigators. All these people have been fired out the door, while there was a lot of cheering on the sidelines.

I know where the cheering came from. The polluters of this province were happy. When some of the more

right-wing members of this government went to the business types who—not the good business people who are there to protect the environment, who understand the importance of preserving the environment, but to those who thought the government was in their face. There were two promises I can remember being made, one by Mike Harris saying not a penny would be cut from the Ministry of the Environment budget—he said that in 1995. Well, that was certainly not a promise made, a promise kept. That was a promise broken. The one that was kept was, "We'll get the Ministry of the Environment out of your face," and indeed the Ministry of the Environment is out of a lot of faces today. And we're paying the consequences, not only in the field of water safety but in so many fields for which the Ministry of the Environment has responsibility.

**1540**

We had the Provincial Auditor, in his report which came forward—the Provincial Auditor is totally independent; he's not political at all. He's a person who's an officer of this House. He warned us about the problems with the drinking water system and indeed of other environmental problems. That was Erik Peters.

Eva Ligeti, who was the Environmental Commissioner, warned us about problems with the drinking water system. Her reward was to be booted out of office; she was fired by this government. They can say, "No, her term was up," they can say what they want; she was doing an excellent job as Environmental Commissioner. I was at the last press conference she gave and the one question that wasn't asked—I suggested to somebody that they ask the question near the end—was, "Do you think your job's in jeopardy as a result of this report?" I knew it was in jeopardy because this government does not brook criticism; if you disagree with this government, whether you're a hospital board, whether you're any kind of board they have to deal with, they bully you out of the way. That's the consequence you pay, and she paid the price, for being honest and forthright with the people of the province. She got fired.

And who did they replace her with? They replaced her with the president of the Progressive Conservative Association federally in North Bay, in the riding of Nipissing, a person who was twice a Progressive Conservative candidate. Now, he may be a fine gentleman, he may fit another responsibility where you actually want to implement government policy; but you do not take a person who's been a critic of the government out of that position and put a person who's going to be compliant with the government, who is a known friend of the government and a known friend of the Premier in a position where that person is a watchdog. It's unfair to that person and, most important, it's unfair to the people of this province. But that's what happened, and that's what always happens with this government. As soon as you disagree with it, as soon as you dare to criticize it, you're in trouble. That's why so many people were silent while they destroyed hospitals in this province, while educational

institutions were underfunded, while some municipalities were underfunded.

And mentioning municipalities, the most ridiculous situation exists today: The Premier is now blaming the municipalities. I thought it was the NDP that was at fault, because the Premier said, when he was up in Walkerton, "Well, it was the NDP." That was a silly accusation; it had nothing to do with the NDP. And then he turned around and said: "It's human error. There's nothing wrong with us; it's human error." Then he found out that wouldn't fly. Then he was being pressed for a public inquiry and he said: "It's the opposition's fault. I guess I have to call one." Because they wanted a legislative inquiry where the Tories would dominate and dictate who could be seen and when they could be seen. And today it's the municipalities. He said, "If only they had spent their money on water and sewer projects."

Let me tell you something: They have to spend so much money on other projects that have been downloaded by this government, other responsibilities—land ambulances, public housing, public health, roads—a number of things that have been downloaded to municipalities. In the region of Niagara there was an \$18-million additional responsibility that they had to take on—that's net—as a result of the downloading exercise. And then he says it's the municipalities' fault. They should be insulted. I hope to hear from AMO on this. I'd like to see the Premier at the next AMO conference getting the standing ovation from some of the compliant and agreeing municipal heads out there. I want to see those people standing and applauding as the Premier accuses them of being responsible for the water crisis in this province. Clearly, they are not.

We've had a series of reports. We have the Sierra Legal Defence Fund report. The member for Broadview-Greenwood and I attended. We were lonely at that because we didn't see too many members of the news media at that time; they were busy with other things, I'm sure. I looked and there was very little attention given to that. That was a major report. Do you know what it said? "Who's watching our waters?" Well, we know who's watching our waters today.

We've had the North American Commission for Environmental Co-operation—and I must congratulate the government. You've fallen from second place to third-worst polluter in North America, according to their report.

The Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy, the Conservation Council of Ontario, the Ontario Medical Association and the Ontario Clean Air Alliance have all been issuing reports critical of this government's environmental record and lack of environmental initiatives. And what happens? No action until, as Jim Coyle said in his column last Thursday, seven dead people.

They've closed the Ministry of the Environment labs. They were good labs. They were top-notch people. I'm going to tell you something I truly believe, and there's nothing political in this. I truly believe that if the Ministry of the Environment had found the results of that test,

they would have immediately notified the medical officer of health and things would have been shut down in Walkerton, because that's their responsibility. They're accountable to the cabinet, they're accountable to this House, and they're accountable to the people of this province.

We also had a situation where the Ministry of the Environment staff were so stretched that they were unable to follow up on the situation in January and April of this year, when Walkerton's water showed some signs of contamination. That happens with so many municipalities, because these people are run ragged. They're unable to do half the things they used to be able to do just a few years ago.

We have the resources stretched to the limit, people fired out the door, even in the water divisions—various divisions which I've talked about in this House before. Those people were fired out the door because they were considered to be unnecessary. We're way behind in the discharge reports and the drinking water reports. They used to be out yearly. I know they're difficult to compile, but when you have no staff, you can't compile them at all. They're way out of date, so the public doesn't know what's going on.

Then we have the announcement about the Red Tape Commission—just last week, Frank Sheehan and Bob Wood as chairs of the Red Tape Commission. What was their responsibility? To get these regulations out of the way that are bothering people, bothering polluting people, and to weaken legislation. So we've had legislative moves and regulatory moves which have weakened the regime in the province when it comes to controlling the environment, and that is simply not acceptable, but that was very, very predictable. I hope all the people out there who applauded that effort and said we had to get rid of red tape understand what it means today to get rid of that red tape. The same people who applauded these massive tax cuts—while this government is cutting essential services to these people—I hope they understand today the consequences of the Common Sense Revolution, because the people of Walkerton do, and people in the rest of this province too.

The environmental assessment and approvals situation has been weakened considerably in this province. That's not a glamorous part of the job, but it is an important part of the job. I notice they sent OCWA up there, the Ontario Clean Water Agency. You know what they want to do with that? They want to undermine it with every effort possible, and they want to privatize it. That's what they think of OCWA. But I'll tell you, when they were in the middle of a crisis, they called OCWA to go up there. That is a public institution. It's distant from government now, but it was an important component in the protection of the environment.

Premier Harris, who's blaming everybody else—today the municipalities—is always first in line to take the credit, last in line to take the responsibility and first to point the finger somewhere else. This risk to drinking water and risk to the environment sits squarely in the

hands of the government. They made a decision: Tax cuts are popular.

You know what? I look at the \$200 that's going out to everybody. How many people in Walkerton do you think would like to have that \$200 spent on environmental protection? How many people in this Ontario of ours would say, "Keep the \$200—it's a stupid public relations trick—and spend that on essential services"?

That's how we're different from Americans. We believe in strong protection for our environment and for our health care in this province.

This government claims to be tough on crime. Well, they're soft on environmental crime, because the prosecutions are way down in this province. As well as that, the fines are way down. Ministry staff have been told to offload responsibility to municipalities for what they call the minor crimes. That's not what they think about when they think of Rudy Giuliani. These people think that small crime should be dealt with when it's squeegee kids, but when it's environmental polluters, well, let's forget about those. Staff have been told to be business-friendly in the Ministry of the Environment. They know what "business-friendly" means. It means to ignore many of the environmental problems that we have.

I'm down to one minute. It's unbelievable, but I'm down to one minute this afternoon. That's what happens with these new rules in the House, by the way: We never get to debate these things as we should.

1550

What can I say in the one minute that hasn't already been said, I suppose? Let me put it this way. I was part of a government that invested hundreds of millions of dollars in environmental protection and hired hundreds of staff, key staff, to help implement that policy. We were criticized for that. If I am to be accused of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to protect the safety of drinking water in this province and the environment in this province and hiring the staff, the expert staff and the dedicated staff to do it, then I plead guilty this afternoon and I would never change that again, for we're seeing the consequences of avoiding that investment and avoiding the implementation of staff changes that are required to implement those policies.

There are many stories in the newspaper which talk about the dreadful state of the Ministry of the Environment today and the discouragement that people have. I hope that the province has awakened to a genuine crisis in our environment.

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood):** I can't say I'm happy to participate in this debate today, because it's a very unhappy occurrence indeed that causes us to be here today having this debate. However, it does give us an opportunity to discuss what happened and what we might be able to do to make a difference in the future, because that is absolutely the only good that can come out of this terrible tragedy.

One of the things that I want to do first is put on the record—and I stood on a point of order; it wasn't a real point of order, as pointed out by the Speaker, but I

wanted the Minister of the Environment to correct his record from May 31, 2000. Just a few days ago in this House, in response to a question I asked him, he mentioned to me that the NDP had cut \$200 million from the Ministry of the Environment. Since that time I've heard other members say that. In fact, I was on Focus Ontario, I believe it was, with the member for Northumberland, who said the same thing. It sounds like members have been told: "Hey, this is the line. Say that the NDP cut \$200 million from the environment budget."

They know that that isn't so. What had happened—

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** It is.

**Ms Churley:** No, it isn't a fact, and listen carefully. The NDP government spent more money on sewer and water projects than ever before, more than any other government in this province. The \$200 million was transferred from the Ministry of the Environment budget right over to the newly created, highly respected Ontario Clean Water Agency. That's what happened to that \$200 million. And I don't want to hear another member in this House from that side, from the government side, use that as yet another blame tactic to blame somebody else, when it isn't the fact. The \$200 million went directly into sewer and water projects in this province. So I hope that is the end of that.

Mr Speaker, I want to read to you a couple of excerpts from Hansard just to put this in perspective. This didn't just come out of the blue, as you know. I'm going to read from Ontario Hansard, April 22, 1997, and the first quote is from my leader, Mr Hampton, who's asking a question to the Premier. This is after an Environmental Commissioner's report. His first question is: "What will it take to get him to realize that his government has to stop clear-cutting the laws that protect Ontario's environment? What will it take?"

Then later on Mr Hampton says: "It's obvious that the Premier hasn't read this report. Premier, this report has nothing good to say about your government. In fact, this is what it says in reference to your government's decisions. In reference to one decision, it says, 'This decision most likely increases the risk of inadequate drinking water testing in Ontario.'" That's what the report said.

Mr Hampton went on to say: "Drinking water, Premier—essential for human health. Then it says, 'With budget and staff cuts announced in 1996, it is questionable whether MNR will be able to adequately audit and enforce the law.'"

Then on that same day a question from me to the Premier—this is something that I said: "Premier, as the Environmental Commissioner says, the problem is that the commission last year stopped testing water supplies and forced municipalities to pay private labs up to five times as much as the cost in the ministry labs. That means taxpayers are paying more, and it's not even a legal requirement that they're certified or accredited labs." Then I asked: "Premier, is this government so out of control, are you so determined to download and privatize, that you won't even take responsibility for safe drinking water?"

That was in April 1997 when these facts were pointed out to the government of the day. Let me go on. In Hansard from June 24, 1996, I'm quoting from a speech I was giving to the House about environmental deregulation and cuts:

"Then the total 1995-96 operating budget, MOEE capital budget reductions, reduced municipal assistance programs, the Ontario Clean Water Agency; I'm going to dwell on that for a minute because I think we're going to have some serious public consultations about what's happening to the protection of our drinking water. If there's anything more fundamental—I guess the air we breathe—but our drinking water. Reducing the municipal assistance program, otherwise known as MAP, is absolutely unbelievable."

I go on to say: "I remember recently, and we'll all remember, that in this House we heard about cryptosporidium in the water in Collingwood. The minister said there was no proof that it was caused by the agricultural runoff, but what we found out is that the commissioner of the environment said there was a request for a review of that very same issue—obviously people were worried about it—and it was turned down.

"We know that our drinking water can be vulnerable to this. You'll recall that a person died. I know that people die from smog. It costs our health system about \$1 billion a year. Not a whole lot of people, we'll all agree, have died from this, but it's scary to think that we know it's out there and that the minister refused to do a review. The government has said it won't do anything about it, and one of the things it did was cancel the Clean Up Rural Beaches program. That was a program that helped farmers in rural communities protect water supplies from the agricultural runoff that I mentioned earlier that is the suspected cause of cryptosporidium." I said at that time, 'I believe that program should be brought back.'

"The other thing that's happened, as I mentioned earlier, is that the minister has cancelled all new funding for MAP. They're not even taking any new applications. That means funding is being cancelled for water and sewage projects. We know that municipalities in many cases, especially the smaller ones, are not going to be able to undertake the necessary changes to the water systems. They don't have the funds because, if you'll recall, this government also drastically cut, almost in half, the transfer payments. This means there's going to be a bigger risk to people's health.

"We know that we need filtration systems in about 40 most vulnerable communities. Who's going to pay for it? What's going to happen in the meantime? I really urge the government to bring back this funding, because we're talking about one of the most fundamental things we rely on in life, that is, clean drinking water."

I remind you that I made this speech in the House June 24, 1996. I'm going to read you a quote from the *Globe and Mail*, April 23, 1997. This is an interview by James Rusk, who is now at city hall. We all remember when James Rusk from the *Globe and Mail* was here. He

interviewed Eva Ligeti after a very damning report about this government's environmental record. I'm just going to read a few quotes from here: "She stressed that government cutbacks have compromised environmental protection, particularly in three areas: the testing of drinking water, acid rain and the inspection of pits and quarries."

Let me take a moment here to talk about acid rain, although that's not the topic of this discussion today. We heard over the weekend that the government has just downsized almost completely their acid rain program after a year or two ago firing one of the top acid rain scientists in the world, and now that program hardly exists.

Anyway, Mr Rusk went on, and I remind you again this is April 23, 1997: "However, she said she could not point directly to any environmental deterioration that has resulted yet from the government's actions. 'What you're looking for is dead bodies, and we're hoping to avoid that. The point of my report is to point out to the ministries that I reviewed that there are a number of safeguards that need to be implemented.... If we don't do that, then we will be seeing more of the kind of tragedy that we saw in Collingwood.'"

#### 1600

The Environmental Commissioner of Ontario warned this government in 1997 that there could be dead bodies—she hoped not—warned this government that it could happen. I and many others warned this government—and it's in Hansard—in 1996, 1997, back even to 1995 when they started to make the cuts, that these cuts, this deregulation, this downloading was going to have an absolutely adverse effect on the environment and health in this province. It was, and still is today, responded to by the government of the day, by the Mike Harris Tory government, as partisan rhetoric. Here we are today and we have at least seven or nine people, maybe more, dead—

**Interjection:** Maybe 11.

**Ms Churley:** Maybe 11 dead as a result of the poisoning of the water in Walkerton.

When I came out publicly very early on when we heard about this horrible, tragic incident, the first thing the minister and the Premier did was to blame the NDP and then to say that we're making this a partisan issue and it isn't political. I've got to tell you, it's political. It's the political decisions that we make in this place about where our tax dollars go and how we spend them that sometimes can make the difference between life and death.

It's time that we started to have that debate again about the connection between our tax dollars and the critical public services that sometimes can mean the difference between life and death. That's where we are today. When you cut a ministry over five years by \$100 million and about a third of its staff—and direct cuts to the water services. We know that in 1996 the MOE cut staff assigned to water and drinking water to 42%, from 113 to 48; staff assigned to groundwater and hydrology to 53%, 28 to 15. That's just the tip of the iceberg. There have been cuts all across the board. Regional offices have



been shut down. The people there cannot do their jobs any more. There aren't enough of them.

The minister has taken all of the staff, I understand, and assigned them to deal with the emergency in Walkerton. I've got to ask, given that we don't have enough staff, who's minding the rest of the store? We don't have enough staff as it is to take care of problems across the province. What's going to happen if there's an emergency in another place? Who's doing the day-to-day work?

I call on the minister—and my leader asked for it today and I did on Friday—that resources be brought in, if necessary, from across the country—experts, of course. You have to have people who know what they're doing to go door to door, knock on the door, check the pipes, check the appliances, make sure that those people—and I see the minister nodding and maybe they're willing to do that now, to create that kind of emergency situation, like we did when we brought the army in to shovel snow in Toronto. Surely we can get people from all across the country, experts to come and knock on doors. Therefore it shouldn't take six to eight weeks if you have, I suppose, a SWAT team, a safe water action team, or something like that. SWAT—I like that. But get a SWAT team in there and get them up and running and trained really quickly to go door to door so people can get back to some kind of normal life again.

When the Taking Stock report from the Commission for Environmental Co-operation came out the other day I was shocked to find out—not shocked that Ontario was the third worst, after Texas, generator of pollution in North America. What I was shocked by was the minister's response. He complained about the methodology.

Even if he's got a problem with the methodology—although I have a document where his own ministry staff say there is no problem with the methodology; but let's just give him the licence to say, "Oh, well, we don't agree with all the methodology. They should do this, this and that"—wouldn't you think that the Minister of the Environment, particularly after what's happened in Walkerton, would say: "But it's not good enough. We're concerned. We don't like the fact that we're number three. We want to do something about it. There is some merit in this report; there are some good suggestions in this report. We want to improve and do better in Ontario and we're going to fight hard. I, the minister, am going to fight hard at the cabinet table to get those resources put back into the Ministry of the Environment." It's totally unacceptable.

I'm going to read you another quote from Hansard. This is from April 3, 1996. It's a question; I'm not sure who it's to.

"Those of us who live in the province of Ontario are blessed in that we have long been able to take clean drinking water for granted. It's practically a birthright. There are so many parts of this world in which that is sadly not the case.

"I want to suggest it's time to put an end to that complacency here in Ontario. The recent problems with the

contamination of the water supply in Collingwood have concerned us all, though none more so than the local residents. It appears that Collingwood has enough money to be able to solve the problem, but what assurance do the other 43 communities at risk have that they can deal with this problem if it hits them? I think if there is a lesson in Collingwood, it's to remind us what a precious and valuable resource clean, pure, drinking water is.

"This government likes to pretend that Ontarians aren't concerned about the environment these days, but it continues to cut and slash. This government has even eliminated funding for new water filtration systems and the CURB program, which was designed to prevent agricultural runoff, believed to be the cause of the problem in Collingwood. Absolutely incredible.

"It's time that this environment minister, apparently so intent on destroying the environmental gains of the last 30 years, started to realize that when she allows the environment"—and this was a different Minister of the Environment—"to be compromised, she allows our health to be compromised."

This is a connection that I and my party have been trying to make all along, that we're not just tree-huggers out there, although I believe very much in protecting our natural heritage and animals, but it's far more than that. It's about our health. We've seen directly what can happen if we don't have somebody minding the store and if we don't have the checks and balances in place, so that when something does break down, those checks and balances click into action, which is partly what seems to have happened in Walkerton. A number of right things happened. I find it really interesting that the scientist who let the ministry and the medical officer of health know what had happened was in fact an employee who worked for the Minister of the Environment for 26 years as a scientist. He tested water. Then when the government completely privatized the labs that test drinking water in this province, he lost his job. So he set up his own company. He knew the rules because he had worked for the government. The irony is that the lab that took over, from what we understand from what they've said and what we heard, did not know, did not understand the reporting structures, and only told the municipality.

We certainly have to have checks and balances, and indeed not only checks and balances. The minister has announced, and quite rightly, that they're going to put some tough regulations in place. I believe we need a lot more tougher regulations in place. Certainly when the resources aren't there—and that's what worried me very much, as in some of the quotes from these Hansards from a few years ago—to keep those checks and balances working, then you've got a problem.

**1610**

I know that the Minister of the Environment was very shaken throughout this whole ordeal. I sat in a press conference and watched him cope with the real human element of that. All of us have been heartbroken by this, and for all of us, including the minister, this is a very, very difficult thing, but not nearly as difficult as what the

people of Walkerton have had to face. People have died and for their loved ones it's almost unbearable.

I don't know about you but when I was walking around on this beautiful weekend I couldn't help but think about those people who weren't with us in this beautiful weather on the weekend because they've died prematurely because of this. I guess it's on all our minds that when a tragedy like this happens, it has a profound effect on us and we want to do something about it. So what I want to say to the minister today is that you can bring in all the regulations in the world but if you don't have the resources—that means the money to enforce the front-line workers to be out there to monitor, to inspect, to lay charges, all of those things—it's not worth the paper it's printed on. That's been proven already.

We have evidence that since this government took power—and the Minister of the Environment knows this, it's in black and white, it's written down—prosecutions and fines have gone way, way down. What that means is either one of two things or a bit of both: that the government is turning a blind eye to those who are polluting or they don't have the resources there. They don't have the people to go out and do the monitoring, to do the enforcing, to make the charges. In my opinion, that seems to be what's happening. If you don't have the people there to make sure that's happening, then there's going to be a breakdown in the system.

Today, I asked the minister once again to do a couple of things now, and I've been calling on him for some time to do this. I'm not satisfied with his answer and I believe that the people of Ontario would not be and will not be satisfied with his answer. People want to know that their water is safe now and they want to know whether their water treatment plant is about to break down. We have some old infrastructure in this province.

I understand that the Premier said earlier today, and it seems to be more a part of this blame game, that it's the municipalities' fault. They haven't spent their money wisely. It's up to them to spend money, to allocate to fix their aging infrastructure. I was astounded by that. It's just more of the blame. You've got a situation where we know this.

A few years ago, municipal transfer payments were severely cut. The downloading happened so that these small municipalities, as well as the large ones, have huge new responsibilities. Despite the fact that the Premier continues to say that it's revenue-neutral, it isn't. The studies have been done. It isn't revenue-neutral. These municipalities are scrambling. They're having to make some terrible choices. When you get a situation where you have to find a private lab and it's going to cost you up to five times as much as it cost you when you were getting it done by the government, and you're trying to weigh that—"How many times should we test the water?"—with all of the other responsibilities, the public health responsibilities etc, that have been downloaded, we have some evidence that some wrong choices have been made on that.

The reality is, it is a government responsibility to make sure, if nothing else, that our water is safe to drink and our air is clean to breathe.

We now have a government that has downloaded most of those responsibilities on to municipalities. The larger municipalities can do a better job in fulfilling those obligations. This is the only government I believe in North America, the western world, that does not contribute to the cost of running public transportation. The city of Toronto is managing but it's really difficult. The smaller municipalities have to make these difficult choices. They don't have enough resources to do it all.

What amazes me is that for the past couple of years, under a number of different environment ministers—and the Premier said this and I've heard others say it: "Well, you know, the NDP left us a terrible deficit and we have to balance the budget. We have to give away all these tax cuts because we promised it. Those are our priorities, and it's all your fault because you let the deficit go up"—all of those excuses. "We have to keep a balanced approach. We can't really do a lot on the environment while we're doing these things."

I don't agree. I believe that, as when we were in government, despite the recession, we made some choices and we decided that protecting our environment, protecting our health, was worth borrowing money for and raising the debt. We made that decision. In retrospect, a lot of people would agree now that it was the right decision. But we did invest more money than any other government in sewer and water projects across this province by transferring \$200 million over to the new Ontario Clean Water Agency. We had the municipal assistance program, which this government cancelled. We had a number of other programs that have now gone by the wayside.

I just want to tell you about some of the tests that aren't happening now to water that used to happen regularly. Yes, it costs more money and more resources, but they are very important tests. This happened in 1996; here it is.

"In view of the intensive sampling conducted by individual operating authorities, sampling by DWSP for microbiological parameters was discontinued as of June 1996." I believe that's the test that looks at E coli.

"DWSP results show that commonly used agricultural pesticides are rarely detected in source waters in northern Ontario. As a result, the frequency of pesticide analysis in this area has been reduced ... the frequency of pesticide sampling of raw water sources in non-agricultural rivers/watersheds has been reduced."

Mercury: "As a result, once a baseline is established for mercury and cyanide at each location, sampling for these parameters is discontinued."

Then there's a whole bunch more in this document, a ministry document, that as of 1996 they're not even testing for any more.

The message here is very clear. The government can no longer use this, in my view, totally unacceptable excuse, as it did in the past: "We've got to balance the

budget and give away all these tax cuts” that, as we know, mainly benefit the rich. They don’t have that excuse any more. The budget is balanced. They’ve given all those tax cuts—\$8 billion or more in this latest budget—and yet they cut another \$16 million out of the Ministry of the Environment. I don’t understand it. I didn’t understand it. I’m confused by it. Why would they do that when we’re rolling in money and \$8 billion has been given away, when we know the Ministry of the Environment has been cut to the bone? It just shows they have no commitment to environmental protection in this province.

I am going to leave a little time for my colleague Gilles Bisson a little later. I know he wants to speak to this. But let me say in all sincerity, in my part of this debate, that this is an opportunity for the Harris government to take its responsibility to protect our environment seriously, to stop laying blame wherever they can, to say, “Perhaps you’ve got a point there, and perhaps you’ve had a point all along, that it’s not a good idea to cut this much money out of the Ministry of the Environment.”

1620

I know in the election—and yes, we didn’t win. We only elected nine members. But we had a policy that we believed in that no other party did. We were the only ones. People didn’t buy it; I admit that. But one of our policies, one of our promises, was that, if elected, we would hire back at least 500 of the front-line workers who were fired and that we would put millions and millions of dollars—I forget the amount—back into the Ministry of the Environment. We made a lot of other promises that, yes, included spending around health and education and the environment, and we said we’d take back the tax cut from individuals making over \$80,000 a year.

People didn’t buy our message, and I accept that. What I don’t accept, and what I didn’t promise when our party did not win and we ended up being the little party, the third party in this place, is that I change my position on that. I don’t believe you can make these promises as, frankly, the Liberals did in the last election. They said they were going to do a lot of the things that we did, but without taking back any of that tax money. We always asked, “Where’s the money going to come from?” With all due respect to everybody in this place, when we’re talking about something as vital and fundamental as the water we drink, the food we eat and the air we breathe, I think we would all agree that the majority of people across this province, when asked whether they would rather have that \$200 put in their pocket or have safe, clean water they can rely on, would say: “Keep your \$200. Put it into an investment in safe water in this province, an investment in cleaning up our air, so that we know we and our children and our grandchildren are going to be safe when they”—I need a drink of water, actually—“pick up that glass of water.”

So I urge the government: The most important thing they can do besides having the public inquiry—and we’re looking forward to very broad terms of reference and an interim report to deal with the immediate situation in

Walkerton. We’re looking forward to a massive reinvestment in the Ministry of the Environment in terms of resources and money, and I’m very much hoping that tomorrow the Minister of the Environment will stand up and make that announcement.

**Hon Dan Newman (Minister of the Environment):** I’m saddened, as I know all members of the Legislative Assembly are, by the tragedy that has unfolded in Walkerton. It has been a traumatic time for local residents and their families, and it has touched the hearts and raised the concerns of Ontarians of all walks of life and from all corners of our province.

I’m sure the first and foremost thoughts of all of us here are with those who lost friends and family. For those who are still sick, I pray for their speedy recovery. I offer my sincerest thanks to the people of Ontario: the medical practitioners and nurses who are taking care of the sick, the municipalities and industries that have offered assistance and donations of drinking water, and the members of the public who have rallied to provide support to help the residents of Walkerton through this tragedy.

The government is indeed very concerned about the residents of Walkerton. The Premier; the Honourable Elizabeth Witmer, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care; and I have personally met with the residents of this community to deal directly with the events of the past few weeks in order to offer what information we can to help understand what happened in Walkerton.

My ministry and the government as a whole have reacted without delay to deal with the emergency and to respond to the longer-term issues that are emerging. Bill Murdoch, the MPP for Bruce-Grey, on behalf of the government announced immediate funding of \$100,000 to help ease the financial burden of those Walkerton residents who have unusual expenses such as finding accommodations out of town for their families, or to permit relatives to visit people who are sick. As the Premier himself has indicated, more assistance will be available if required to meet the needs of the people of Walkerton. Today, two new offices are operating, one local and one provincial. These offices are there to allocate funding, to answer questions and to assist the people of the Walkerton area.

In terms of dealing with the environmental problem, I took prompt action to ensure that the municipality has access to a safe long-term supply of drinking water. On May 24, ministry staff met with the local public utilities commission, their consultant and the town council to review the operating procedures, to develop and action plan to confirm the source of the problem, and to return the town’s water supply to its previous safe state. In fact, on May 25 my ministry issued an order requiring that the action plan be implemented immediately.

As many as 11 deaths are being investigated, although some of the deaths may not have been caused by the E coli bacteria. Hundreds have been made sick, and we are committed to finding out exactly what led to this tragedy as quickly as possible. There are currently four investigations underway. On May 31, this government

announced a public inquiry to review the circumstances leading to this situation; an investigation is being undertaken by the Ontario Provincial Police; the coroner has called an inquest into the deaths of nine people believed to be linked to the E coli outbreak; and my ministry's investigations and enforcement branch is conducting an investigation into the events that led to the contamination of the municipal water system.

I hope to get answers soon. The people of Walkerton deserve answers and the people of Ontario deserve answers. This government is determined to get to the bottom of this.

In the meantime, I am taking steps to ensure that the procedures that are in place are met and that protection of our water supply is strengthened. On Monday, May 29, I instructed my ministry to prepare regulations to strengthen the protection of Ontario's drinking water supply. Ministry of Environment staff are developing a regulation, notice of which has been posted on the environmental registry. In preparing this draft, we phoned a wide range of stakeholders, as well as municipalities. These would include groups such as Pollution Probe, the Canadian Environmental Institute for Law and Policy, the Toronto Environmental Alliance, and the municipal waterworks association. I know this is a short notice period for members, but the deadline for public comment is 5 pm on Tuesday, and I would welcome any input that they may have on this.

To put it simply, the draft regulation includes important and mandatory elements.

First, all laboratories, including laboratories at the water treatment plant, that perform tests on drinking water must be accredited by an agency such as the Standards Council of Canada, which works in tandem with the Canadian Association for Environmental Analytical Laboratories. This accreditation will include proficiency testing where available for those parameters covered under the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives, which set out Ontario's criteria for drinking water quality. To date, municipalities have been strongly encouraged to use accredited labs. The new regulation will make it mandatory.

Second, municipalities must inform the Ministry of the Environment if they change the private laboratory facility that is testing their water. This will allow the ministry to follow up, to contact the new lab and to make sure it is fully aware of its role and obligations.

Third, current procedures in place require testing labs to notify the Ministry of the Environment and the local medical officer of health, as well as the municipality, of test results indicating unsafe drinking water. The notification requirements will be made absolutely and unequivocally clear. If any laboratory finds that a test result indicates unsafe drinking water quality, it must immediately inform the Ministry of the Environment and the medical officer of health, as well as the municipal water facility operator. The ministry will require a municipality to put a clause in the contract of every lab they use agreeing to immediately notify all three if they find a

problem, and the ministry will require every waterworks to do so itself unless they are sure notification has already taken place.

The Ministry of the Environment will review each and every certificate of approval currently in place for water facilities owned and operated by municipalities or the Ontario Clean Water Agency.

In the new regulation, all water treatment facilities must have their certificates reviewed at least once every three years. These certificates spell out the standards and levels of performance that each facility must meet and the conditions under which they operate. Ministry staff will inspect all municipal water treatment facilities in Ontario over the next six months to ensure that there is full compliance with laws intended to protect human health and the environment.

#### 1630

Every municipal water treatment facility in this province must meet the conditions set out in its certificate of approval, as well as the requirements of the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. Legally binding orders will be issued, where appropriate, for any failure to comply with these objectives. Facilities where the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives have been exceeded in the past, or where problems have been identified, are first in line for inspection.

Ministry staff are reviewing certificates of approval for all municipal water treatment facilities. The review focuses on three areas: (1) making sure disinfection is appropriate and adequate, (2) protection of the water supply from contamination, and (3) consolidation and updating of all certificates of approval in our province. With this approach, each municipal water treatment facility in Ontario will have one new certificate of approval that clearly sets out what is approved, reaffirms the requirements of the new regulation and incorporates appropriate and necessary site-specific conditions for operating the facility.

We are continuing to work with the medical officer of health from the Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound Health Unit, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care and the town of Walkerton to determine the source of this contamination. The town has turned over the operation of the municipal system to the Ontario Clean Water Agency. The agency is working with the municipality to get the municipal system cleaned up as quickly as possible. In addition, as a precautionary move, I have contacted municipalities across Ontario to advise them of what they should do if they have any concerns regarding E coli in their water supplies or if they receive calls from concerned citizens on private wells.

I'm sure that we can all agree in general that the municipalities in Ontario have consistently provided, and will continue to provide, their residents with some of the safest drinking water in the world. We all need to work together to help restore the public's confidence that the province's drinking water is clean and safe.

The residents of Walkerton are still under an advisory from the medical officer of health to boil water before

they drink it. Testing of the water supply is being conducted and results have confirmed that the source of contamination is a strain of E coli. Testing will continue in order to monitor the improvement in the water supply, and the municipality has elevated the chlorine dosage level in the wellhead and throughout the distribution system, and is also currently flushing the distribution system 24 hours a day. It will likely be three to four weeks before we can recommend to the medical officer of health that the system can be restored to use.

The Ontario Clean Water Agency, consultants for the town of Walkerton and the ministry are all taking daily water samples throughout the town. This will continue until we are assured that the system is free of E coli. This process is expected to cleanse the drinking water supply system and return it to its normal safe state. My ministry is continuing to monitor the situation, along with the town and the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.

In conclusion, I want to say again how saddened we all are by this tragic event and to assure local residents and their families that the hearts of all Ontarians are very much with them.

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglington-Lawrence):** What the citizens of Walkerton have been put through is just beyond belief, and I don't think we appreciate the depths of their suffering yet. I think we owe it to them to ensure that this doesn't happen again, to them or to anybody else in this province.

If you look at this government, they were proud of the fact that they were cutting the Ministry of the Environment. They boasted that this was a ministry they could cut by 40%. Over the last five years, in this very chamber, they boasted about cutting that ministry. As you know, they cut 40% of its budget—one third of its staff fired, laid off. They were proud of that.

This government is really where the finger should be pointed. They like to point fingers at the NDP. We've heard the Premier say that. Now they're talking about the municipalities, that they should have been on guard. But this is a government that downloaded so many responsibilities on to municipalities—downloaded, back loaded, side loaded—it made it impossible for municipalities to do their job, because they never appreciated municipalities. The upheaval the municipalities are going through—the restructuring, the amalgamation, the consolidation—most municipal councillors or reeves don't know what's up because of the reckless changes of this government. They have been reckless and thoughtless. In fact, if this government were considered as a parent, they should be charged with environmental abandonment and neglect. They have been neglectful of their job.

They were supposed to protect the environmental concerns of this province. They haven't done that. They've walked away from it, and blatantly, not quietly. As I said, they were proud of what they call deregulation—downloading or privatization, whatever. Basically they walked away from their responsibilities and left it to a haphazard, checkerboard system that they were warned about. The Provincial Auditor told them, "You can't do it." The

Environmental Commissioner was fired because she told the truth.

We've seen the way this government treats the environment. We've seen that it totally neglects other areas, like smog. There are 1,000 people a year who die of smog in this city. Where is the Ministry of the Environment? What are they doing about that? As you know, in this budget there wasn't one cent put towards public transit, which could alleviate smog concerns in Toronto. Was the Minister of the Environment talking to the Minister of Finance saying, "Put some money into public transit and get rid of that smog"? I'm sure he was a silent partner at the table, if he was even at the table.

I think the Ministry of the Environment has lost the confidence of everyone in this province. They don't have the confidence of any citizen in this province. They've done a disgustingly poor job of defending that mandate, which is to protect the environment in every area.

I've been dealing with trying to protect the rain barrel, the water source of the greater Toronto area at the Oak Ridges moraine. The Ministry of the Environment is nowhere to be seen. We've got a lake just north of Toronto, Lake Wilcox, which is on life support. There are two lake lungs there, because there is no oxygen in the lake. It's on its last legs.

They don't care and they show no initiative, no government policy. The environment has been at the very bottom of everything this government has done; in fact, they've used it to get votes from their right-wing wacko supporters to say: "Look, we're neglecting the environment, vote for us. Aren't we great?" That's what their policies were. Very, very clearly, environment was not something that they thought was at all important, and we've reaped the whirlwind because of this reckless downloading of responsibility without knowing the consequences or caring about the consequences of what it's doing to people. So whether it's about water, whether it's about air quality, whether it's about even teaching environment—the concerns about environment in our curriculum—this government has put the environment on the back burner.

They need to not only talk about regulations—here's the minister talking about regulation. He's talking about bureaucratic claptrap. They should put millions of dollars back in. Put the millions back in. Hire those 900 people back. Put the inspectors back. Stop talking about it and undo the damage by putting those resources back and bringing a serious attempt to protect the environment. Right now all we have is blaming, excuses, passing the buck and looking for someone else to point the finger at.

This government has been disgraceful in its neglect of the environment. No one who believes they can do their job, so they've either got to replace the minister—bring in a whole new program and do your job to protect the legacy that the people of Ontario expect to the protected: their water, their wildlife, the natural beauty that they have throughout this province. They should be ashamed of themselves.

1640

**Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):** I as well would like to begin by expressing my sympathy for those families and individuals in Walkerton who have experienced loss. Walkerton was and continues to be a terrible tragedy for our entire province, and it shook many people in my riding as well and I'm sure it shook people across Ontario. As we begin to sort out what went wrong in Walkerton, two things are important: making sure that people of that community are helped in any way possible and making sure that no other community has to go through what Walkerton has experienced.

I'd also like to say how much we all appreciate what people have done, what they've donated in the form of time, money and supplies to help get through this tragedy. It's heartening to see how Ontarians can band together to lend a hand when times are tough. We think back to the ice storm in eastern Ontario, for example, and now Walkerton. The generosity and selflessness out there is encouraging. Doctors, nurses and other health professionals who have taken care of the sick throughout this ordeal have certainly gone above and beyond the call of duty, and all those who have helped out there deserve our collective gratitude. Our prayers are with those who continue to battle the effects of E coli.

Today, as Environment Minister Newman has indicated, the Brockton Response Centre opened to help distribute humanitarian aid from the province and from citizens. Last week the government created a \$100,000 fund to help families with food, rent and other expenses, and former MPP Barb Fisher is heading up the distribution of this money to Walkerton residents. The government is working in a coordinated effort with this response centre. The ministries of health, community and social services, tourism, agriculture, economic development and trade and the environment are all pitching in, and the people of Walkerton deserve nothing less.

When considering this motion today, we have to make one thing clear from the start: Municipalities in Ontario have always been responsible for providing safe, clean water to their residents. This is the case across the province. This is the case in Walkerton. As well, the responsibility for testing drinking water resides with the facility owner. They have always collected the water samples and submitted them to a lab, as required by the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. Water facility owners were paying the Ministry of the Environment laboratories for water quality testing as early as 1993 under the NDP government. This change did not come about as part of our government's changes. It was changed by the previous government. Up until 1993, the testing services provided by the ministry were mainly for routine water quality analysis that could also be provided by accredited private laboratories. In 1996, as we've heard, the Ministry of the Environment decided to stop doing the analysis of water samples for municipalities because of the widespread availability of this service from private water-testing services. It was decided that the Ontario

government did not want to compete with the private sector on a fee-for-service basis.

We have heard opposition members point to the testing of water done by private facilities as a problem, ironically even from the NDP, who initiated this practice. However, the public-versus-private debate that they are trying to initiate is a red herring. It really does confuse the issue. What's important here is not who is doing the testing; the important thing is to get to the bottom of two questions: (1) Was the testing done properly and what did it show? (2) If there were problems, why weren't the results widely known and acted upon?

Regardless of whether the lab testing water is a ministry facility or a private lab, its obligations remain the same. When a test showing unsafe water comes up, the lab is obligated to notify the water provider, the ministry and the medical officer of health. This is set out clearly in the province's Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. After water is resampled, the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives state: "If the resampled water exceeds its maximum allowable concentration, then the medical officer of health and the ministry should be notified and monitoring at a frequency designated by the district officer shall continue, in order to define the source. Monitoring should be continued until the problem has been eliminated."

That is very clear. It tells the testing facility to report unsafe results to the local medical officer of health and to the ministry. Unfortunately, there were communication problems in the Walkerton case and a tragedy, as we all know, was the result. The system, the drinking water guidelines, if they are followed, provide checks and balances. In future, we have to make sure that the guidelines are followed to the letter, and Environment Minister Newman has announced ways this can be done.

Little more than a century ago, major cities of the industrialized world introduced sanitary sewers and introduced potable water systems. As a result, the incidence of water-borne disease began to decline. In France, for example, life expectancy showed a dramatic increase, from age 32 to age 45, between 1850 and 1900. Much of the science and many of the public health principles involved here are time-tested and proven.

We heard the Minister of the Environment speak earlier about the ministry's rapid movement to rectify the problems that have been identified. It's important for members to realize what the ministry is doing to make sure that water is safe to drink and for all Ontarians to know what the ministry is doing as well. The ministry is bringing in regulation, as has been indicated a number of times, in four key areas.

First, the requirements for reporting of unsafe water tests will be absolutely clear. These changes will require any laboratory which finds an unsafe test result to report that result immediately to the Ministry of the Environment, to the drinking water facility owner and also to the local medical officer of health. Communication breakdowns cannot occur.

Second, these changes will require all laboratories to be accredited by an agency such as the Canadian Association for Environmental Analytical Laboratories, including the certification of those labs.

Third, municipalities will have to inform the ministry if they change labs.

Fourth, the ministry will review all approvals currently in place for water facilities and will put in place a regular review of these water facilities.

These are important changes. Even though there are three investigations underway into what went wrong in Walkerton, plus a public inquiry soon to be opened up, Minister Newman moved quickly to come up with solutions to some of the problems identified when the severity of the Walkerton situation became known. The system needs a comprehensive approach, a belt-and-suspenders approach, to make sure that nothing falls through the cracks. People's well-being is much too important.

As well, in recent days much has been said about the farming community and the effects of intensive agriculture on water if it's not managed correctly. As most members know, I was part of a consultation process on intensive farming this past winter where Dr Galt, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment, and I, as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment, have received 130 presentations and about 200 written submissions. The public sessions were attended by over 700 people, people who came together this winter in community halls and towns like Burford, Glencoe, Clinton, Orangeville, Chesterville, Hastings and Guelph.

Why did the government undertake this consultation? Quite simply, there was concern over the impacts on water quality and quality of life coming from some of these large livestock operations. The objective was to gather enough information to be able to develop a plan that will ensure the viability of Ontario's agricultural sector while protecting our environment and our quality of life.

#### 1650

Many of us realize farming has changed over the past decade. For example, growing up, I lived on a truly mixed farm of 600 acres. We had many different kinds of animals. We had broilers, laying hens, shorthorn cattle, both beef and a dairy herd, as well as a variety of crops: corn, soybeans, winter wheat, alfalfa. That type of farm is what most people think of when they think of the traditional family farm. These days the farm is still in the hands of a family operation in most cases, but we're seeing an increase in single commodity operations. These farms, perhaps run by a father, several sons or daughters, have grown to be able to compete and out of necessity must compete in the global marketplace.

The increasing size of farms, along with the fact that fully 25% of Ontario's population lives outside of our major urban centres, can give rise to conflict. Of that 25% of people living out there in rural Ontario, a very small percentage are farmers. The vast majority of people

living on our back roads, our concession roads, are in many cases rural, non-farm residents.

With larger operations, we have seen the integration of agricultural production, an integration of processing, marketing and financing. To some communities, it may appear that these more corporate operations make more corporate decisions, perhaps showing less environmental stewardship, and they ask whether these corporate operations share the community-based ethics we would expect from the traditional, more diversified family farmer. Communities have been concerned about not only water quality but odour and do expect government to do everything in its power to ensure that health concerns are met.

In these issues, there's a role for both provincial and municipal governments. What has happened to date in rural Ontario, and what's happening now in this new development, has been a mix of legislation, policy, local bylaws and recommended management practices. There are solutions that recognize that Ontario needs and wants a farming sector but a high priority must be placed on environmental protection.

We must keep in mind that the requirements for municipalities with regard to drinking water are not new. They are well established, well known and understood by all parties.

I would note that the requirements are very clear in directing the laboratories to immediately notify MOE, to notify the MOH and the facility that's operating the water system. In 1995, a letter was sent to all owners of water facilities in Ontario and the ministry made it clear that the owner of a facility must notify the MOE district office immediately if there is any indication of unsafe drinking water.

In 1997, the ministry issued a document that clearly stated laboratories must report unsafe water to the proper organizations and people. We know that if these procedures had been followed, the tragedy would have been averted.

A system is in place to ensure Ontarians have safe drinking water, and the system works when everyone holds up their side of the bargain. It's a system that's based on testing, the communication of those test results and action to rectify any problems that are detected.

Obviously there was a breakdown in Walkerton. At some point, the information did not get to the proper people and, consequently, was not acted upon, and the people of Walkerton paid that terrible price.

There are currently four investigations underway into what went wrong. The government has called for a public inquiry. The terms of reference are very broad. As well, the OPP and the coroner's office are involved and the Ministry of the Environment is conducting its own investigation. In the meantime, everyone is working to try to get things back to normal in Walkerton. I know it must be hard for residents to even think about normal any time soon, but normalcy will come. Walkerton is still under a "boil water" advisory and the water supply is being tested. These results, as we know, have confirmed E coli,

and the testing will continue to monitor improvement in the water supply.

I know the residents of Walkerton will have a hard time ever trusting their water supply again. There was an article in the paper this morning about a couple, not surprisingly, who have lost faith in the water system. This fallout is natural but it's very troubling given the great supply of fresh water that we in this rich province have access to. Walkerton has shaken the confidence of many people across the province, and now all levels of government must work together to help restore that confidence in our water supply.

Unfortunately, we have to take action, and that's one of the legacies of this tragedy. To do this, we will work within the system that was put in place by previous governments and that has been up to the task of providing safe, clean, potable water to Ontarians. The system is clear in laying out responsibilities and it gives good guidance to those who use it. It is well known and consistent across the province, and it can work if used properly. After Walkerton, however, it has become clear that we have to work harder to ensure that the system does work properly. It can't fail. There's too much at stake. One person unnecessarily sick is too many, and we do have both the ability and the system required to provide safe water for everyone in Ontario.

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** For me, this issue of the environment is tremendously important because it speaks directly to the responsibility that government has in protecting the environment for the greater good. I'm going to speak to it in regard to another issue that is going to end up becoming a time bomb, and I can't seem to get the Minister of the Environment to deal with it. It has to do with the expansion of a hazardous landfill site that took place in Moore township in my riding, one that sits on top of an aquifer that of course is connected to the Great Lakes.

In 1997—and here we go again, changing rules without anticipating or thinking about consequences—this hazardous landfill dump was expanded to become the largest in Canada. What makes this a crucial issue is the fact that at the very beginning of the review of the expansion, the ministry considered the application which included the omission of what they called the acceptance step, and this enabled the minister to approve the undertaking without first accepting an environmental assessment. In other words, they fast-tracked, and again we had problems on this dump last year. It was supposed to be an impregnable liner, but there was a flaw. It leaked. Now we can't even get a permanent, full-time inspector on the site, and it's the largest hazardous landfill in Canada. The minister will not provide an inspector who will deal with at least overseeing what's happening. There are repairs being made, because there are some very critical areas that have to be repaired, and we can't get a geotechnical engineer from the ministry to oversee what's happening on this dump.

Again, right in the review it says that the predicted environmental effects are that the proposed landfill con-

tinuation—this was in 1997—could potentially result in two distinct impacts: changes to the quantity of ground-water available for off-site water use, and changes to the quality of groundwater off-site as a result of the movement of chemicals from the waste. So here we've got this potential time bomb, and again the minister doesn't see this as an important enough issue to bring in a full-time inspector.

Water and air are not a renewable resource, if we're going to minimize the value of what government must do for the environment. We're on an aquifer. This site, by the way, is self-monitored. Basically, they can bring in all the waste they want and they can decide what the criteria are, because we don't have someone from the ministry looking after the store, overseeing what is happening. On this whole issue of the environment, this government has a horrible track record, and unfortunately the price has been way too high for their cutbacks.

**1700**

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I appreciate having some time to put my comments on a very important debate in regard to what has happened at Walkerton.

Let me first of all say this: I believe what has happened at Walkerton is an example of the failure of this government and the failure of government generally. Let me explain what I'm getting at. We understand that we have a system of government that by way of collecting taxes provides services to the people of Ontario and the rest of this country to be able to make sure certain things are done. One of the most fundamental things that we citizens take for granted is that our provincial government would be responsible for making sure the water that comes out of our taps is safe and potable and we don't have to worry about getting sick after we drink the water.

I said when I opened up that this is a demonstration of the failure of government. I think what it demonstrates is that when government tries to pretend, as this government has tried to pretend, that they are the anti-government government and that they are going to get government downsized and reduced and more efficient and all those buzzwords they used, in the end there's a cost to doing that. One of the costs that we're seeing, unfortunately, is many lives in the community of Walkerton that have been lost because this government chose not to do its job and take its responsibility when it comes to making sure that basic services are provided for the people of Ontario.

I say categorically that these people would not have died if Mike Harris had not been elected to government back in 1995, pure and simple. Why? Because the government chose, after 1995, that it was going to be the anti-government government, and in doing so they were going to do a number of things that all led up to this tragedy. The first thing they did was that through the mantra of the Common Sense Revolution and eventually by way of actions through Bill 26 and a number of other bills that came to this House, this government, in the need to "streamline" environmental regulation and legis-



lation, gutted most of the progressive legislation and regulations that existed on the books to protect citizens when it came to environmental disasters.

**Ms Churley:** They called it red tape.

**Mr Bisson:** They called it red tape. I remember, as Marilyn Churley says, that the government said, "We know this environmental legislation gets in the way of business. We know it's a hindrance to the private sector. We're going to get rid of all that and create a Red Tape Commission," along with some legislative measures they took under Bill 26 and others, "to just get rid of all this red tape that stands in the way of people making profit." We at the time, as the opposition, said, "That's wrong." Quite frankly, those laws were put there for a reason. They were put there because we learned over the years that if we didn't have proper legislation and regulations, people would do some pretty odd stuff when it comes to what corporations and even municipalities and provincial governments would do. I say, as I said earlier, that if the government had not been elected in 1995, I truly believe these people would still be alive.

Let me just give one more reason why I think that is the case. The government, as you know, after 1995 decided it was going to basically get out of the water testing business. Up until 1995, the province of Ontario provided to municipalities who so chose the ability to have their water tested by provincial labs or, in the case of some municipalities, they went to private labs. But the bottom line was that up until 1995, and certainly under the watch of the NDP government under Bob Rae, municipalities who went to provincial labs knew that their water was being tested by an accredited lab and that there were inspections to make sure that the testing facilities were adequately staffed and proper tests were carried out, so they were assured at the end, when the tests came back, that what was said in the test was actually certified.

For municipalities that decided to go to private labs, because we allowed that to happen under our government—when the members get up and say we started privatization, that was not at all the case. Some municipalities decided that they wanted to go to private labs. We said, "If you want to pay for it and you want to go off to private labs, that's your business, but we will make sure that the provincial government, the Ministry of the Environment, is there to, first of all, accredit your lab and, number two, to do the inspections in the private lab to make sure the tests that are being done are the same as the tests being done within the provincial system."

What did the Mike Harris government do, after being elected in 1995? Specifically, in 1996, they stopped testing the water. They stopped the labs that were testing the water, I should say, and they stopped accrediting those labs. In fact, when they downloaded to the municipalities all of these services that they were doing in the Who Does What process of downloading, they gave municipalities eight weeks to organize themselves on where they were going to get their water tested when they basically shut down the provincial water labs. There were four labs that were run by the province of Ontario, and when

Harris shut them down in 1996, he gave municipalities but eight weeks to get organized and to find somebody else to get their water tested by. Once the municipalities went to the private labs, because they had no choice at this point, unfortunately these labs were not accredited and, as we find out now, were not being properly tested. I should say, to correct the record, that some were accredited; unfortunately, others were not.

I say that the government is responsible. I know that they're sincere when they say they're sorry that it happened. I'm sure they didn't want it to happen. I'm sure that the Premier and the Minister of the Environment and members of the Conservative government feel badly about what happened to the people of Walkerton. I believe that and I don't discount that. But you have a responsibility. You decided to be the "ungovernment government." You decided, as Conservatives—I should say the Tom Long Conservatives of the day, the Reform Party or CRAP or whatever else you're called—that basically you wanted to get government out of the face of people.

You said: "Environmental legislation doesn't matter. Environmental regulation gets in the way of business. Let's get rid of that. No longer do we need good environmental standards in the province of Ontario, because we, the Conservative alliance of Ontario"—CRAP party or whatever you call yourself, the Tom Long gang—in the end, that was not desirable. It stood in the way of business. We're finding, unfortunately, some five or six years later, that there's a cost to your policy. The policy is that if you leave people and companies to their own devices, unfortunately, at the end, sometimes people will get hurt and, as we found in this case in Walkerton, people die.

The second thing that you did is you said: "It's more important to give people a tax cut, because we know that's the way to go. We're the Conservative Party of Tom Long and Mike Harris, and we want to make sure that in the end we give people a tax cut because that's going to make Ontario better."

Yes, people got their tax cut. You and I did. I know members of this Assembly, as I did, got a tax cut. People went away thinking maybe that was a good idea. By and large, if you look at the polls, the Tories were very popular for giving a tax cut. But we were the only party—the NDP—who had the courage, even knowing that it was not politically expedient to take the position that we did, to say that in the end there's going to be a cost to this tax cut. Yes, you're going to get \$20 or \$30 extra a week, if you're lucky. If you makes lots of money like we do here in the Legislature, over \$80,000 a year, you're going to get a bigger tax cut.

But in the end, is it worth it? I say no. As a New Democrat, I say the tax cut was wrong. We shouldn't be giving out tax cuts, first of all, in a time when we had a deficit. We should have made sure that the money was there to do things like water testing, to make sure that the private labs were properly accredited, to make sure that audits were done, to make sure that things ran the way

that they should, so that when people walked up to their tap in their kitchen or their bathroom and tried to pour themselves a glass of water, they didn't have to worry about being poisoned.

Now, unfortunately, I ask you this question: How many people in this province feel totally secure that the water they drain out of their tap that they're going to drink is safe? That's a sad thing. In the province of Ontario, the largest province economically and by way of population, the economic heartland of Canada, we have a situation now, after five or six years of the Conservative Alliance here in Ontario, called the Conservatives—that's what they like to call themselves—where we're not sure when we open our tap that the water we drink ain't gonna make us sick. I say that's a very bad condemnation of this government. One of the most basic things that you would think is important is that the government would make sure there are basic infrastructures in place for our communities to operate, and one of the most fundamental things you have to have is water itself.

1710

I say to the government, you will rue the day that you've done this, because I believe this is sort of the beginning of the end for you. There is going to be at one day or another an election. I believe that your time is coming, and when you're defeated people will look back at this day and look at what happened in Walkerton as the beginning of the end of the Conservative Party of Ontario when it came to their holding government, because this issue demonstrates the failure of this government when it comes to its responsibility to the people of Ontario.

I don't believe for one second that when people—Mike Harris, Tom Long and others—made this decision to do the things they did, they wanted to hurt anybody. I don't believe that for a second. But their blind ideology that getting rid of environmental regulation and legislation was a way to stimulate economic development we said then and we say now was a bad idea, and the tax cut was a bad idea because in the end what we end up with is government that doesn't work. If people are not able to walk up to the tap and pour a glass of water and drink from it with confidence, I think that basically reflects badly on the government of Ontario.

I say to the members across the way, you can try as much as you want to blame others for this—no, it wasn't the NDP. We didn't decrease spending when it came to the Ministry of the Environment; in fact, you guys did that under your own watch. No, it's not municipalities, as Mike Harris tried to make people believe last week in this Legislature when he said he felt some municipalities were not being responsible when it came to maintaining their water system. You can point the finger everywhere you want, but at the end of the day the finger points right back at your government. You're the government that basically got rid of the labs, you're the government that basically cut the funding and you're the government that basically made the decisions you did that led to the tragedy of Walkerton.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party, we said then and we say now you were wrong to do it, and unfortunately it has taken these deaths to demonstrate the failure of this government. For that I truly feel sorry, because that is something that nobody should have to pay.

**Mr Galt:** I certainly appreciate the opportunity to join in with this debate. I'm really quite concerned at the member for St Catharines in the style and the way he has brought this forward. I find it quite disappointing that the opposition, as well as the third party, is trying to win brownie points on a very tragic event, a tragic event that's really quite hard for all of us here to comprehend.

I sometimes draw the comparison with an air crash, and I'll probably do a little more of that later on. But here we had an infection that sort of randomly hit people in the community, who ended up with a very toxic type of infection. Certainly my empathy goes out to those who are recovering today and the suffering they've gone through, not to mention those who are grieving for their lost ones. There's no question that this government is genuinely concerned and devastated, just as the people in Walkerton are. I certainly know every member of our caucus is deeply concerned with what happened in Walkerton back in the month of May.

Also, my heart goes out to the mayor of that community. Something all of a sudden hit him, unprepared, being hit with a feeding frenzy of the media as they raced into town to get this front-page story. Tremendous, horrendous pressure on this individual. It had to be a very intimidating position for him. Certainly watching him on some of the TV clips, I thought he did extremely well in a very difficult situation.

Also, compliments are in order to the medical community, both in Walkerton as well as in London. They certainly came through at a time when it was very, very important to come through.

My belief is that the people in Walkerton want to get on with their lives. Certainly that's what I'm reading in the press. They want clean drinking water at their taps as soon as possible. They want to find out what the facts are and what indeed went wrong here and then ensure this doesn't happen again. That's an awful lot like what happens after there is an air crash. Those are certainly very tragic events. Thorough investigations are carried out on the aircraft that crashed, not every other aircraft that's of the same model that happened to be made and still flying. They investigate that particular one very thoroughly. Then there are changes in protocols or changes in procedures, changes in equipment, to try to prevent those things from happening again, particularly, if it's human error, what kinds of alarms or devices they can put into those aircraft to make sure it doesn't happen again.

As I review some of the things that happened during the tragic event, I'm very proud of our government and the action they took. On May 25, the Minister of the Environment went up to Walkerton and the Minister of Health went to the hospital in London, offering whatever they could from their ministries. On May 26, both the Minister of the Environment and the Premier went to the

community of Walkerton, again offering whatever assistance was at all possible.

Then the following Monday, on May 29, the Minister of the Environment came forth with some four new regulations that would be written and put through cabinet, ranging from that all of the labs testing this water would in the future have to be accredited, although that was always recommended under the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. That accreditation of course would be with the Canadian Association for Environmental Analytical Laboratories. The second point he was making was that if there are any changes in which labs the PUCs use in Ontario, they would have to notify the minister of those changes. There would be a review of all the certificates of approval for all of these water treatment facilities, and this will happen every three years. And of course the information coming from those test laboratories is being expanded to include the Ministry of the Environment, the public utilities or their owner, and the medical officer of health. It will now go directly to the medical officer of health and not be left in the hands of the PUC managers.

Early last week it was announced that there would be an all-party legislative committee that would investigate this issue, this problem. That's exactly what Mr McGuinty, leader of the official opposition, requested on May 26, the Friday before. But then, lo and behold, he voted against it. I find that deplorable, that he couldn't make up his own mind. That was one more step we were taking to ensure this wouldn't happen again. A coroner's inquest was announced. There's an OPP investigation announced. The Ministry of the Environment is doing their investigation. Then later on we agreed to a full public inquiry, which is the top type of investigation that can be carried on in the province of Ontario.

At the same time, we've put in OCWA, the Ontario Clean Water Agency, to look after the operations of the water treatment plant in Walkerton. Some \$100,000, plus all the resources, were put into Walkerton to try to get them back on track as quickly as possible. Now Barb Fisher, a previous MPP, a very distinguished MPP in this Legislature, is in Walkerton to look after some of these things. The \$100,000 announced last week will be a kick-start to keep families with food, rent and other out-of-pocket expenses.

The centre is also working with our provincial office to provide one-window access to government programs and services. Representatives from the ministries of community and social services, tourism, health, agriculture, environment, and economic development and trade are all available to answer questions. Certainly this one-window approach will be of great assistance, I hope, to the people of Walkerton.

The opposition is so anxious to claim where that responsibility was and point fingers: What went wrong? How did it go wrong? But this indeed is a very, very complex issue. There are many organizations, many stakeholders with their fingers in this, from the municipality, to the PUC, to the medical officer of health, to the Ministry of the Environment, to testing labs, and on it

goes. I just find it so disappointing, the way the opposition has tried to capitalize on this. I just find them morally bankrupt. I think of Mark Twain and his comments, "Get your facts straight first, then you can distort them as you please." Well, they're distorting something they don't have yet. If they had the facts, then they could go ahead and distort them if they wanted to.

1720

What I've heard this afternoon—"If only you'd spent more money, it wouldn't have happened." "If only more money was spent" is the total answer to both the official opposition and the third party. If spending more money was going to improve this province, by 1995 this would have been utopia, perfection, with the amount of money that was spent by both the Liberals and the NDP. But unfortunately in 1995 some 10,000 to 50,000 people, net, had lost jobs in Ontario, so obviously it wasn't working.

The way the opposition has come on is a real disservice to the PUCs across this country, the waterworks across this country, which have engineers in charge and doing just an excellent job. But to hear them talking you'd think it was all a total disaster.

What Mr McGuinty was recently saying is very embarrassing. On May 29 during a CFRA radio interview, he was making fun of small-town Ontario, making fun of small PUCs. Let me read what he said. He starts with, "Um ... and what we've got now, Rick, throughout the province of Ontario, especially in our smaller communities um ... they've got people who, um ... who really don't have the expertise, um ... and who need, um, governments acting, ah, in kind of a expert advisory capacity." Now, I'm quoting.

"Somebody who goes in a few times a year and meets with ... the guy who's operating the water treatment in some of our smaller communities, Rick, is probably also cuttin' grass. And when we talk about water, you know, that's the stuff you get when you turn on the tap."

A brilliant comment on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Galt:** It is a shame. Shame on him for condemning small-town Ontario and condemning somebody who has a job and might, through efficiencies, go out and cut some grass.

When the Task Force on Rural Economic Renewal that I'm chairing toured Ontario, what we were hearing in small towns was that they want to keep the youngest, the brightest in their community and not be insulted by people like the leader of the official opposition. What does that do for small-town Ontario? It's a real disservice.

I've been listening to some of the debate here today, and I get the feeling that if all the power for environment was centralized, everything would be OK. But as soon as we move to something like Bill 74 and some of the education debate, oh, no, no, they want the powers decentralized and spread out to all the school boards—don't let the Minister of Education have any power. But

when it's the environment and something is a problem, oh, we have to centralize it all.

I personally think the non-confidence that has been shown in this Legislature by the opposition parties, by so many things that are happening here, is absolutely appalling. The first thing was the all-party legislative committee that was struck and ready to go. They showed non-confidence in it. They jumped up and down saying that the government backbenchers will take over and they won't have any say in it, and on and on it went—absolutely appalling.

Then they talked about the OPP investigation—no respect for the police in this province. I think the OPP do a great job. It's unfortunate that they would downplay that.

Then they talked about the coroner's inquest. That wasn't good enough, a public type of inquiry.

Then the Ministry of the Environment, which they've said so many good things about, that we need more of it, when they do an investigation, they played that down. That wasn't going to be good enough.

Then when we agreed to a public inquiry, what was the response? Well, that's not going to be good enough because the scope isn't going to be big enough. It's not going to be this and it's not going to be that. I just didn't know when they were going to finally be satisfied.

Then I hear them talk about private labs and scientists, showing non-confidence in private labs. Does that mean that physicians in private practice aren't good enough? Does that mean the pharmacist in your local drugstore isn't good enough because it happens to be a private operation? No, I don't think so. It's just something that they can show non-confidence in and have a great song and dance about. A scientist is a scientist is a scientist. Their ethics are every bit as honourable in a private lab as they are in a public lab. But I was a little overwhelmed by their support of public labs because yes, we have a tremendous number of very competent scientists in our public labs as well.

It's interesting. I was in three different debates this past week and I requested each and every time that they name me a regulation that's been changed or name me the money that's been cut that's having an effect of Walkerton. Not once in those three debates was there a response from the opposition or anyone else I was debating with. We hear all these broad—brush comments about how terrible it's been, but get right down to the facts, get right down to the individual case, and they have no response.

I don't think there's any question. The bottom line is that had the proper protocols and procedures been followed, we would not have ended up with this very tragic situation that did occur in Walkerton. That's simply the situation.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I'd planned some different remarks until the member from Northumberland gave his remarks. To suggest that somehow or other people are playing politics with this situation, to suggest that this isn't a serious, dramatic,

major situation and for the member from Northumberland to essentially say, "Well, nobody's got any faith in what's gone on," that we're just simply playing politics—11 people died.

I hadn't planned to give the remarks in this tone, but nothing could be more important to this Legislature than dealing with that situation, and yes, we demand a public inquiry. We demand that this be at arm's length. We demand that it not go to a legislative committee set by Premier Harris with a committee Chair he's chosen to remove from his cabinet.

I will just say to the public of Ontario, the committee system around here is now a sham because of the way Premier Harris has set it up. Our legislative committee tried to deal with a major tax bill last week. The government would not even send the Minister of Finance there to defend it.

I say to the member from Northumberland that 11 people are dead and we are going to demand and insist that we find answers to this situation. I don't care what you say about it. I don't care how political you think we are. We will be as political as we need to be to find answers to this situation.

I would say to the member opposite, we are embarking now on a corporate tax cut of 40%. The corporations in this province are going to get a 40% tax cut. Fine. The people who benefit from capital gains are going to see their capital gains cut by 33%. The people who are making millions of dollars on capital gains are going to have their taxes cut by one third. Fine. People are going to get tax-free \$100,000 of income. Fine. We're going to cut personal income taxes, Mike Harris says, by another 15%. I remember before the budget, Mike Harris had one demand on the federal government, "Cut personal income tax by 20%." He never made a demand to increase health care spending. It was all about cutting personal income tax by 20%. In this budget, it says, "Harris wants corporation taxes cut at the federal level by 40%." That's what Mike Harris wants, cut corporate taxes by 40%, cut personal income taxes by 20%. What is the result? Eleven people are dead in Walkerton, and why? Because something went dreadfully wrong with the water system there.

The member from Northumberland says, "The Leader of the Opposition is playing politics." This is a political situation of the first order. My leader has rightly demanded a full public inquiry into this and Mike Harris finally, because the public demanded it, has agreed to it. I would just say to the government itself says this: "We have cut the environment budget. We have cut inspectors dramatically. We have downloaded on to municipalities 100% of the cost of our public health units. We have downloaded on to them responsibility for sewage and water treatment plants." This is what Mike Harris has done.

I would just say that we will today, tomorrow and forever demand that we have answers to what happened at Walkerton. Eleven people are dead, and I think the public of Ontario deserve an answer to that question.

1730

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** I rise today to speak to the motion standing in the name of my seatmate, the member from St Catharines. I want to say, as someone who spent some time at home last week, that I certainly have to report that my constituents, whether they live in the city of Pembroke, where I live, or in communities like Arnprior, Renfrew, Eganville or Deep River in the rural part of the Ottawa Valley, are all very concerned about the reports out of Walkerton and the tragedy at Walkerton.

I listened to some of the debate this afternoon. I simply say to my colleagues, if you don't do anything else today you might—I choose this carefully—read the article in the Saturday National Post by Paul Waldie. It's a one-page chronology of what, in the opinion of the National Post, happened at Walkerton over the last few weeks and few months. I've chosen the National Post for obvious reasons. It's not a newspaper or a news organization that would be considered hostile to the Harris government.

I'm not going to read the chronology as presented by Mr Waldie, but I want to say this: I think any citizen of Ontario who read that article on Saturday would have to conclude, or could easily conclude, that what happened in Walkerton could happen in their community. That's not to say it would, that's not to say it will, but the chronology of Walkerton as presented by Mr Waldie in the Saturday National Post is, I say to all honourable members, and most especially the member from Northumberland, who, unlike many of us, brings a certain scientific literacy to this debate—and I say that advisedly. I want to say, lest you get the wrong impression, I really thought that his speech was regrettable, really regrettable, particularly for a man of science.

**Mr Galt:** I consider that a compliment.

**Mr Conway:** I'm sure you would. But what I found on the weekend, and what I've found for the last few days, is that there is a very real crisis of confidence in our ability to satisfy the public in large and small communities, in communal and in private water systems, that in fact it is safe. I happen to believe that in most cases the water supply is safe. But again, when I look at the Post article, boy, I can see how individuals might come to a different conclusion. There is clearly, and there has been, a significant failure at the Ministry of the Environment to provide reasonable oversight insofar as a regulatory function.

I see my friends, a couple of members from Ottawa here. This is not related directly to the water issue, but there is a coroner's inquest currently going on in Ottawa about a tragedy that occurred a couple of years ago where a young man plummeted to his death when a bungee-jumping device failed. All I know is what I'm hearing reported by the Ottawa media from that coroner's inquest, but the one conclusion I think you could reasonably come to is that the regulatory function at the Ontario Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to those operations is woefully inadequate,

according to the testimony of the inspectors themselves. I'm sure when that inquiry is concluded, the ministry and the government and the Legislature are going to want to look very carefully at what testimony has been advanced in that inquiry.

I think the most scary thing of all in this Walkerton business is that most Ontarians—I suspect all Ontarians—go to bed at night and get up in the morning thinking that people like the Ontario Ministry of the Environment are actually out there doing a job and that, yes, there may be local responsibilities for the water system, but there is going to be a real and meaningful fail-safe backup at the provincial level. That is clearly an unreasonable belief in Ontario in 2000, because as Waldie's article makes plain, and as I suspect the judicial inquiry will make even more abundantly clear, we appear to have failed the people of Walkerton in doing our job as a provincial government, most especially at the Ministry of the Environment, in providing the kind of reasonable oversight that thousands and millions of Ontarians who consume water in this province on a daily basis had every right to expect we were providing. That, more than anything else, is the reason I want a judicial inquiry that's clear and independent, so that this issue of public confidence can be addressed in some real and meaningful way.

**Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East):** I am pleased to join the debate. I think what is tragic about what we're talking about today and what has happened in Walkerton is that these deaths were preventable. These deaths should have been, could have been, avoided, had the government taken the proper steps in assuring that safeguards were in place when it came to protecting the environment.

Over 900 staff have been let go from the Ministry of the Environment. This government was warned. They were warned three or four years ago when they were going through public hearings on downloading 200 operations to the municipalities when it came to waterworks. Speaker after speaker at the public hearings came forward and said: "Your cuts are a tragedy waiting to happen. You've laid off staff; you've limited resources." You were warned and you did not listen at that time. You were warned after the Plastimet fire in Hamilton that tragedies could occur as a result of your environment policies.

Yes, this is political. You're damn right it's political. It is political because the political actions of this government may have caused up to 11 deaths in Walkerton. That's why it's political. It is political because this government decided that it was politically the right thing to do to cut the Ministry of the Environment by over 900 staff, over 40% of the budget. That was a political decision made by this government, and unfortunately and tragically those 11 people were victims of your revolution, of your blind drive to cut costs without looking at human expense and the price we would pay in this province. It is disgraceful that in the year 2000 in the province of Ontario, in the most industrialized nation in the world,

the most industrialized province of this nation, 11 people would die as a result of the infection of water, as a result of simply going through the act of daily needs, of either drinking a glass of water, using water to cook, or taking a bath. Eleven Ontarians have died as a result of that.

Clearly, this government cannot run away from its responsibility here. This government can't duck. This is going to haunt you. You're not going to be able to spin your way out of this, as you do on education and health care, because Ontarians now finally, unfortunately and tragically, know the truth, the consequences of your decisions and your cuts. We're seeing it here day after day, and unfortunately the people of Walkerton have lived and have seen this tragedy first-hand.

Push your government to start on the right track, implement the changes that have been recommended here, bring back the staff you've let go, and you know what? Nobody in Ontario is going to criticize you today for spending more money on the environment and protecting their health. Do the right thing today. I ask the government to support this motion. Get the ministry back on track and let's protect the health and well-being of Ontario so there is never, ever going to be another Walkerton tragedy as we have seen in the last couple of weeks.

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):**

The motion today can be summarized with part of the very first sentence: "that this House recognizes this government has abandoned responsibility for protecting our environment..." That encapsulates the thrust of everything that we're talking about here and that has become so painfully apparent to the people of the province in recent weeks as a result of the tragic events that took place in the community of Walkerton.

1740

It seems to me that I can't recall at any time being confronted by any group of voters anywhere who have said to me: "I want the government to get out of the environment business lock, stock and barrel. I feel that we can assume our responsibilities here locally in my town and my city and my community for the clean air and the clean water and protecting green space and for controlling development and for looking after animal and plant life. All those kinds of responsibilities we can now heretofore assume at the local level."

My understanding of Ontario is decidedly different. There is a continuing expectation, and it is a very reasonable one, that there is somebody down there or up there or over there at Queen's Park who is at minimum acting in a supervisory role, acting to oversee things that are happening at the local level, to make sure that everything is OK. Just in case something goes wrong, there'll be somebody from the Ministry of the Environment who will make themselves available, who's on top of this, and will make sure that nothing untoward should happen. I think that's a reasonable expectation that is out there today. But this government has abandoned its responsibility when it comes to protecting our natural environment, and when I talk about the natural environment I'm

not talking about the more abstract concepts like forests and fish. I'm talking about air and I'm talking about water, those things that connect all of us.

The first thing that this government has lacked when it comes to the environment is a commitment, a commitment to offer protection, a commitment to step in and take decisive action when it comes to standing up for the environment. That is not there. We have not witnessed that at any point in time since the election of the Mike Harris government.

That kind of commitment has to be manifested in some expenditures. I said it earlier today, and I'll repeat it: I am not ashamed to call for additional expenditures inside the Ministry of the Environment so that we can offer Ontarians the kinds of protections that they are counting on. Until the Walkerton incident took place, until that tragedy unfolded, people assumed we're there for us, we're there for all of us.

The government is fond of saying that they're going to get rid of red tape, and I'm not sure of many venues where you can go and not get a lot of applause when you say you're going to cut through that red tape, you're going to make things easier for people, you're going to make things easier for business. You know what? The moral of the story here is that some red tape is good for us, some red tape is in the public interest, some red tape is helpful and protects us.

**Mr Galt:** Are you serious?

**Mr McGuinty:** We have a question here from a member of the government which is very telling, very insightful. He says to me, in response to my statements about some red tape being good and desirable—what did he say again? I've forgotten already.

**Interjection:** "Are you serious?"

**Mr McGuinty:** He says, "Are you serious?" Yes, I say to the honourable member, I am serious. I want you to carefully consider now what has just happened in Walkerton. We did not have on the books here in Ontario a law which required people to report certain things, very important pieces of information, to the Ministry of the Environment and to health authorities. You might call that red tape. I call it essential and in the public interest. We did not have a law on the books here in Ontario that required that the private labs which are testing our water be accredited and certified. They might call that red tape. I call that essential and desirable. I call it in the public interest. I call it something that protects people.

I call it something that the people of Ontario happen to be counting on, and they have been shocked with the Walkerton incident. They have been shocked by that revelation that this government—and it's now staring us all in the face in the most painful way possible. We've had seven people who have lost their lives. It may be as high as 11 when all is said and done. We've now come to understand in the most painful and compelling and tragic way possible what happens when a government abdicates its rightful responsibility to have in place those kinds of measures that protect Ontarians.

It is my hope that this government will now understand and see the error of its ways and will begin to invest in the Ministry of the Environment and try to restore it to some original sense of the vigour that it had here in Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown):** Mr Bradley has moved opposition day number 5. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members; it will be a 10-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1746 to 1756.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McGuinty, Dalton
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Bryant, Michael	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Kwinter, Monte	Pupatello, Sandra
Churley, Marilyn	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Levac, David	Sergio, Mario
Conway, Sean G.		

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Palladini, Al
Beaubien, Marcel	Hastings, John	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Johns, Helen	Stewart, R. Gary
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Stockwell, Chris
Cunningham, Dianne	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Tilson, David
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Tsubouchi, David H.
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	Young, David

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 31; the nays are 48.

**The Acting Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

It being past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 of the clock.

*The House adjourned at 1801.*

*Evening meeting reported in volume B.*





**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston  
Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr  
Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers  
Clerk Assistant / Greffière adjointe: Deborah Deller  
Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman  
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Agostino, Dominic (L)	Hamilton East / -Est	chief opposition whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Waterloo-Wellington	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
<b>Baird, Hon / L'hon John R.</b> (PC)	Nepean-Carleton	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Environnement
Bartolucci, Rick (L)	Sudbury	deputy opposition House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition
Beaubien, Marcel (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	
Bisson, Gilles (ND)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	
Bountrogianni, Marie (L)	Hamilton Mountain	
Boyer, Claudette (L)	Ottawa-Vanier	
Bradley, James J. (L)	St Catharines	
<b>Brown, Michael A.</b> (L)	Algoma-Manitoulin	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Bryant, Michael (L)	St Paul's	
Caplan, David (L)	Don Valley East / -Est	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
<b>Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary</b> (PC)	Oakville	Speaker / Président
Christopherson, David (ND)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Richesses naturelles
Churley, Marilyn (ND)	Broadview-Greenwood	chief New Democratic Party whip / whip en chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Clark, Brad (PC)	Stoney Creek	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, assistant deputy government whip / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée, whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Cleary, John C. (L)	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	
<b>Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony</b> (PC)	Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Coburn, Brian (PC)	Carleton-Gloucester	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Colle, Mike (L)	Eglinton-Lawrence	
Conway, Sean G. (L)	Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	
Cordiano, Joseph (L)	York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	
Crozier, Bruce (L)	Essex	
<b>Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne</b> (PC)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Curling, Alvin (L)	Scarborough-Rouge River	
DeFaria, Carl (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Sarnia-Lambton	
Dombrowsky, Leona (L)	Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington	
Duncan, Dwight (L)	Windsor-St Clair	opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / -Nord	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
<b>Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet</b> (PC)	Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation
Elliott, Brenda (PC)	Guelph-Wellington	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation and minister responsible for seniors and women / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs et ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées et à la Condition féminine
<b>Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L.</b> (PC)	Parry Sound-Muskoka	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
<b>Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC)	Whitby-Ajax	Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Galt, Doug (PC)	Northumberland	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Gerretsen, John (L)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	
Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	Scarborough East / -Est	
Gill, Raminder (PC)	Bramalea-Gore- Malton-Springdale	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Travail
Gravelle, Michael (L)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	
Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	
Hampton, Howard (ND)	Kenora-Rainy River	Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
<b>Hardeman, Hon / L'hon Ernie</b> (PC)	Oxford	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
<b>Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.</b> (PC)	Nipissing	Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif
Hastings, John (PC)	Etobicoke North / -Nord	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Transports
<b>Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC)	Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion
Hoy, Pat (L)	Chatham-Kent Essex	
<b>Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim</b> (PC)	Erie-Lincoln	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
<b>Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron</b> (PC)	Burlington	Minister of Tourism / ministre du Tourisme
<b>Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen</b> (PC)	Huron-Bruce	Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, minister responsible for seniors and women / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs, ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées et à la Condition féminine
<b>Johnson, Bert</b> (PC)	Perth-Middlesex	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Kells, Morley (PC)	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	
Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Parkdale-High Park	
<b>Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank</b> (PC)	Oak Ridges	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip, deputy government House leader / ministre sans portefeuille, whip en chef du gouvernement, leader parlementaire adjoint
Kormos, Peter (ND)	Niagara Centre / -Centre	
Kwinter, Monte (L)	York Centre / -Centre	
Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	
Lankin, Frances (ND)	Beaches-East York	
Levac, Dave (L)	Brant	
Marchese, Rosario (ND)	Trinity-Spadina	

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Marland, Hon / L'hon Margaret (PC)</b>	Mississauga South / -Sud	Minister without Portfolio (Children) / ministre sans portefeuille (Enfance)
Martel, Shelley (ND)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Martin, Tony (ND)</b>	Sault Ste Marie	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Cambridge	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General and minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire au procureur général et ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Maves, Bart (PC)	Niagara Falls	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Mazzilli, Frank (PC)	London-Fanshawe	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General / adjoint parlementaire au solliciteur général
McGuinty, Dalton (L)	Ottawa South / -Sud	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLeod, Lyn (L)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	
Molinari, Tina R. (PC)	Thornhill	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Munro, Julia (PC)	York North / -Nord	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjointe suppléante du gouvernement
Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Bruce-Grey	
Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	
<b>Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan (PC)</b>	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Durham	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
<b>Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al (PC)</b>	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Parsons, Ernie (L)	Prince Edward-Hastings	
Patten, Richard (L)	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	
Peters, Steve (L)	Elgin-Middlesex-London	
Phillips, Gerry (L)	Scarborough-Agincourt	
Pupatello, Sandra (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	
Ramsay, David (L)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	
<b>Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC)</b>	Leeds-Grenville	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Davenport	
<b>Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob (PC)</b>	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	Minister of Correctional Services / ministre des Services correctionnels
Sergio, Mario (L)	York West / -Ouest	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Smitherman, George (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	
<b>Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John (PC)</b>	Mississauga West / -Ouest	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Spina, Joseph (PC)	Brampton Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Tourisme
<b>Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC)</b>	Lanark-Carleton	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, government House leader / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Peterborough	
<b>Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)</b>	Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de l'Éducation
Tilson, David (PC)	Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.</b> (PC)	Markham	Solicitor General / solliciteur général
<b>Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David</b> (PC)	Don Valley West / -Ouest	Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement
<b>Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	Minister of Energy, Science and Technology / ministre de l'Énergie, des Sciences et de la Technologie
<b>Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth</b> (PC)	Kitchener-Waterloo	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Wood, Bob (PC)	London West / -Ouest	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire au président du Conseil de gestion
Young, David (PC)	Willowdale	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Finances
Wentworth-Burlington	Vacant	

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Estimates / Budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Alvin Curling  
Gilles Bisson, Sean G. Conway, Alvin Curling,  
Gerard Kennedy, Frank Mazzilli, John R. O'Toole,  
R. Gary Stewart, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**Finance and economic affairs /  
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Marcel Beaubien  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Doug Galt  
Ted Arnott, Marcel Beaubien, David Christopherson,  
Doug Galt, Monte Kwinter, Tina R. Molinari,  
Gerry Phillips, David Young  
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

**General government / Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Julia Munro  
Toby Barrett, Marie Bountrogianni, Ted Chudleigh,  
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,  
Rosario Marchese, Julia Munro  
Clerk / Greffier: Viktor Kaczkowski

**Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: James J. Bradley  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier  
James J. Bradley, Bruce Crozier, Leona Dombrowsky,  
Bert Johnson, Morley Kells, Tony Martin,  
Joseph Spina, Bob Wood  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

**Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales**

Chair / Présidente: Marilyn Mushinski  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Carl DeFaria  
Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant, Carl DeFaria,  
Brenda Elliott, Garry J. Guzzo, Peter Kormos,  
Lyn McLeod, Marilyn Mushinski  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: R. Gary Stewart  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Brad Clark  
Marilyn Churley, Brad Clark, Caroline Di Cocco,  
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Jerry J. Ouellette, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N.  
Tascona, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Public accounts / Comptes publics**

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John C. Cleary  
John C. Cleary, John Gerretsen, John Hastings,  
Shelley Martel, Bart Maves, Julia Munro,  
Marilyn Mushinski, Richard Patten  
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Regulations and private bills /  
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Présidente: Frances Lankin  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Gilles Bisson, Claudette Boyer, Brian Coburn,  
Garfield Dunlop, Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy,  
Frances Lankin, Bill Murdoch  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding appears when space permits.

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions paraît si l'espace est disponible.





# CONTENTS

Monday 5 June 2000

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Dawn Patrol Group Homes</b>	
Mrs Bountrogianni.....	3391
<b>Bowmanville Women's Institute</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	3391
<b>Violence</b>	
Mr Gravelle.....	3391
<b>Westben Arts Festival Theatre</b>	
Mr Galt.....	3392
<b>Ontarians with disabilities legislation</b>	
Mr Peters.....	3392
<b>Doctor shortage</b>	
Ms Martel.....	3392
<b>Snowmobiling</b>	
Mr Spina.....	3393
<b>Water quality</b>	
Mr Bradley.....	3393
<b>Support for agriculture</b>	
Mr Barrett.....	3393

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

<b>Standing committee on the Legislative Assembly</b>	
Mr Stewart.....	3393
Report adopted.....	3394

## FIRST READINGS

<b>Public Housing Preservation Act, 2000, Bill 84, Mr Marchese</b>	
Agreed to.....	3394
Mr Marchese.....	3394
<b>Huron University College Act, 2000, Bill Pr24, Mr Wood</b>	
Agreed to.....	3394

## MOTIONS

<b>House sittings</b>	
Mr Klees.....	3394
Agreed to.....	3394

## THIRD READINGS

<b>Direct Democracy Through Municipal Referendums Act, 2000, Bill 62, Mr Clement</b>	
Agreed to.....	3394

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

<b>Young offenders, government notice of motion number 46, Mr Flaherty</b>	
Agreed to.....	3395

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>School extracurricular activities</b>	
Mr McGuinty.....	3396
Mrs Ecker.....	3396
<b>Northern health travel grant</b>	
Mr McGuinty.....	3397
Mrs Witmer.....	3397, 3403
Mr Bartolucci.....	3403
Ms Martel.....	3404
Mr Harris.....	3405
<b>Walkerton tragedy</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	3397
Mr Harris.....	3398
Mr Flaherty.....	3398
<b>Water quality</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	3398
Mr Newman.....	3399
Ms Churley.....	3399
Mr McGuinty.....	3399
<b>Animal protection</b>	
Mr Galt.....	3400
Mr Tsubouchi.....	3400
<b>Ontario Realty Corp</b>	
Mr Agostino.....	3400
Mr Harris.....	3401
<b>Curriculum</b>	
Mr Stewart.....	3401
Mrs Ecker.....	3401
<b>Ipperwash Provincial Park</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	3402
Mr Flaherty.....	3402
Mr Bisson.....	3402
<b>Grandview Training School for Girls</b>	
Mr Bryant.....	3402
Mr Flaherty.....	3402
<b>Early childhood education</b>	
Mr Mazzilli.....	3403
Mrs Marland.....	3403
<b>Probation and parole services</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	3404
Mr Sampson.....	3404

## PETITIONS

<b>Education legislation</b>	
Mr Bartolucci.....	3405
Mr Wood.....	3406
Mrs Dombrowsky.....	3406
Mr DeFaria.....	3407
<b>Camping</b>	
Mr Bisson.....	3405
<b>Oak Ridges moraine</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	3406
<b>Municipal restructuring</b>	
Mr Gravelle.....	3406, 3408

## Correctional facilities

Mr Ramsay.....	3407
<b>Pension funds</b>	
Mr Hoy.....	3407
<b>Health care funding</b>	
Mr Parsons.....	3407
<b>Northern health travel grant</b>	
Mr Ramsay.....	3408
<b>Highway safety</b>	
Mr Hoy.....	3408

## OPPOSITION DAY

<b>Environmental protection, opposition day number 5, Mr Bradley</b>	
Mr Bradley.....	3408
Ms Churley.....	3411
Mr Newman.....	3415
Mr Colle.....	3417
Mr Barrett.....	3418
Ms Di Cocco.....	3420
Mr Bisson.....	3420
Mr Galt.....	3422
Mr Phillips.....	3424
Mr Conway.....	3425
Mr Agostino.....	3425
Mr McGuinty.....	3426
Negatived.....	3427

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 5 juin 2000

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

<b>Loi de 2000 sur la préservation du logement public, projet de loi 84, M. Marchese</b>	
Adoptée.....	3394

### TROISIÈME LECTURE

<b>Loi de 2000 sur la démocratie directe par voie de référendum municipal, projet de loi 62, M. Clement</b>	
Adoptée.....	3394